arXiv:1704.00134v1 [math-ph] 1 Apr 2017

Homogenization of a Class of Non-Markovian Langevin Equations with an Application to Thermophoresis

Soon Hoe Lim[1,2,*] and Jan Wehr[1,2]

[1] *Department of Mathematics, University of Arizona, USA*
[2] *Program in Applied Mathematics, University of Arizona, USA*

(Dated: April 4, 2017)

We study a class of systems whose dynamics are described by non-Markovian Langevin equations with state-dependent coefficients. We find that in the limit, in which all the characteristic time scales vanish at the same rate, the position variable of the system converges to a homogenized process, described by an equation containing additional drift terms induced by the noise in the considered limit. The convergence results are obtained using the main result in [1], proven here in a stronger version, requiring weaker spectral assumption on the damping matrix. We apply our results to study thermophoresis of a Brownian particle in a non-equilibrium heat bath.

I. INTRODUCTION

From physical sciences to social sciences, many phenomena are modeled by noisy dynamical systems. In many such systems, several widely separated time scales are present. The system obtained in the homogenization limit, in which the fast time scales go to zero, is simpler than the original one, while often retaining the essential features of its dynamics [2], [3], [4], [5]. On the other hand, the different fast time scales may compete among themselves and this competition is reflected in the homogenized equations.

Of particular interest is the model of a Brownian particle interacting with an environment [6]. The usual model for such system neglects the memory effects, representing the interaction of the particle with the environment as a sum of an instantaneous damping force and a white noise. Although such an idealized model generally gives a good approximate description of the dynamics of the particle, there are situations where the memory effects play an important role, for instance when the particle is subjected to a hydrodynamic interaction [7] or when the particle is an atom embedded in a condensed-matter heat bath [8]. In addition, the stochastic forcing introduced by the environment is often more accurately modeled by a colored noise than by white noise.

In this paper, we study a class of non-Markovian Langevin equations with state-dependent drift and diffusion coefficients, driven by colored noise. They provide a realistic description of the dynamics of a classical Brownian particle in an inhomogeneous environment. We are interested in the limiting behavior of the particle when the characteristic time scales become small and in how competition of the time scales, as well as the inhomogeneity of the environment, impact its limiting dynamics. The main mathematical results of this paper are Theorem IV.1 and Theorem IV.3, in which we derive explicitly the homogenization limits for a class of non-Markovian systems. Their physical relevance is illustrated by an application to thermophoresis models.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we introduce and discuss a class of non-Markovian Langevin equations to be studied. In Section III, we derive the Smoluchowski-Kramers limit for a class of SDEs with state-dependent drift and diffusion coefficients,

* shoelim@math.arizona.edu

under a weaker assumption on the spectrum of the damping matrix than that used in earlier work [1]. Using this result in Section III, we study the homogenized dynamics of the non-Markovian models in Section IV. In Section V, we apply the main results of the paper to study the thermophoresis of a Brownian particle in a non-equilibrium heat bath. We end the paper by giving the conclusions and final remarks in Section VI.

II. NON-MARKOVIAN LANGEVIN EQUATIONS

A. The Non-Markovian Models

We consider a class of non-Markovian Langevin equations with state-dependent coefficients that describe the dynamics of a particle moving in a force field, taking into account the inertial effect and its interaction with an environment. Let $\boldsymbol{x}_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $t \geq 0$, be the position of the particle. The evolution of position, $\boldsymbol{x}_t$, is given by the solution to the following stochastic integro-differential equation (SIDE):

$$m\ddot{\boldsymbol{x}}_t = \boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{x}_t) - \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)\int_0^t \boldsymbol{\kappa}(t-s)\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_s)\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_s ds + \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)\boldsymbol{\xi}_t, \tag{1}$$

with the initial conditions (here the initial time is chosen to be $t = 0$):

$$\boldsymbol{x}_0 = \boldsymbol{x}, \quad \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_0 = \boldsymbol{v}.$$

Here and throughout the paper, overdot denotes derivative with respect to time t, m is the mass of the particle, the matrix-valued function $\boldsymbol{\kappa}(t-s) : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ is a memory kernel, the matrix-valued functions $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{x}_t) : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^{d\times k}$ and $\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_t) : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ are the state-dependent coefficients of the equation, $\boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{x}_t) : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is a force field acting on the particle and $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t$ is a k-dimensional Gaussian noise process. The initial conditions $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ are random variables independent of $\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_t,\ t \geq 0\}$. We remark that a more general form of SIDE can be treated by methods of this paper, in which the factor multiplying the integral in (1) is replaced by $\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)$ where $\boldsymbol{f}$ and $\boldsymbol{g}$ are two distinct functions. Study of microscopic dynamics leads naturally to the form (1) (see Appendix **A**), so we are going to limit ourselves to this case.

The SIDE (1) is a non-Markovian Langevin equation, since its solution at time t depends on the entire past. It differs from the usual Newton equation by two terms. One of them involves an integral over the particle's past velocities with a memory kernel $\boldsymbol{\kappa}(t-s)$. It describes the state-dependent dissipation which comprises the back-reaction effects from the environment up to current time. The other term, involving a Gaussian colored noise $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t$, is a multiplicative noise term, also arising from interaction of the particle with the environment.

As remarked by van Kampen in [11], "Non-Markov is the rule, Markov is the exception". Therefore, it is not surprising that non-Markovian equations (including those of form (1)) find numerous applications and thus have been studied widely in the mathematical, physical and engineering literature. For instance, see [12], [13] for surveys of non-Markovian processes, [14], [15], [16], [17] for physical applications and [18] for asymptotic analysis. A variant of SIDE (1), where the coefficients depend on both position and velocity, has been studied in the context of escape rate problem in [19] (see also [20]).

In this paper, we study two special sub-classes of SIDE (1), where the driving Gaussian colored noise is either Markovian or non-Markovian. The first sub-class is the SIDE with

the memory kernel given by an exponentially decaying function, i.e.

$$\boldsymbol{\kappa}(t-s) = \boldsymbol{\kappa}_1(t-s) := \boldsymbol{A}e^{-\boldsymbol{A}(t-s)},$$

where $\boldsymbol{A}$ is a constant diagonal matrix with positive entries, and the colored noise is the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck (OU) process, $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t = \boldsymbol{\eta}_t^0$, i.e. a mean zero stationary Gaussian process which is the solution to the SDE:

$$d\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^0 = -\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^0 dt + \boldsymbol{A}d\boldsymbol{W}_t, \tag{2}$$

where the initial condition is distributed according to the (unique) stationary measure of the process, i.e. $\boldsymbol{\eta}_0^0 = \boldsymbol{\eta}$ is normally distributed with zero mean and covariance of $\boldsymbol{A}/2$. Here $\boldsymbol{W}_t$ is a d-dimensional Wiener process. The statistics of $\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^0$ are given by:

$$E[\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^0] = 0, \quad E[\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^0(\boldsymbol{\eta}_s^0)^*] = \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\kappa}_1(|t-s|), \quad s,t \geq 0, \tag{3}$$

where $*$ denotes transposition of vector.

Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes are the only stationary, ergodic, Gaussian, Markov processes with continuous autocorrelation functions. When all entries of $\boldsymbol{A}$ go to infinity, the OU process approaches the white noise. For details on OU processes, see for instance [21] and Section 2 of [10]. The resulting SIDE for the first sub-class reads:

$$m\ddot{\boldsymbol{x}}_t = \boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{x}_t) - \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)\int_0^t \boldsymbol{\kappa}_1(t-s)\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_s)\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_s ds + \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^0. \tag{4}$$

The second sub-class is the SIDE with the memory kernel given by an oscillatory function whose amplitude is exponentially decaying, i.e.

$$\boldsymbol{\kappa}(t-s) = \boldsymbol{\kappa}_2(t-s) := \boldsymbol{\tau}^{-1}e^{-\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2\boldsymbol{\tau}^{-1}\frac{(t-s)}{2}}\left[\cos\left(\boldsymbol{\tau}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Omega}_0(t-s)\right) + \frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}_1}{2}\sin\left(\boldsymbol{\tau}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Omega}_0(t-s)\right)\right],$$

where $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ is a constant diagonal matrix with the positive entries $(\tau_{ii})_{i=1}^d$, $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ is a constant diagonal matrix with the real entries $(\omega_{ii})_{i=1}^d$, $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_0$ is a constant diagonal matrix with the entries $(\omega_{ii}\sqrt{1-\omega_{ii}^2/4})_{i=1}^d$ and $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_1$ is a constant diagonal matrix with the entries $(\omega_{ii}/\sqrt{1-\omega_{ii}^2/4})_{i=1}^d$. The colored noise is given by the harmonic noise process, $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t = \boldsymbol{h}_t^0$, i.e. a mean zero stationary, non-Markov, Gaussian process which is the solution to the SDE system:

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}d\boldsymbol{h}_t^0 = \boldsymbol{u}_t^0 dt, \tag{5}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}d\boldsymbol{u}_t^0 = -\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2\boldsymbol{u}_t^0 dt - \boldsymbol{\Omega}^2\boldsymbol{h}_t^0 dt + \boldsymbol{\Omega}^2 d\boldsymbol{W}_t, \tag{6}$$

where the initial conditions are distributed according to the (unique) stationary measure of the above system and $\boldsymbol{W}_t$ is a d-dimensional Wiener process. The statistics of $\boldsymbol{h}_t^0$ are given by:

$$E[\boldsymbol{h}_t^0] = 0, \quad E[\boldsymbol{h}_t^0(\boldsymbol{h}_s^0)^*] = \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\kappa}_2(|t-s|), \ s,t \geq 0.$$

The harmonic noise is an approximation of the white noise, smoother than the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. It can be shown that in the limit $\omega_{ii} \to \infty$ (for all i) the process $\boldsymbol{h}_t^0$

converges to the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process whose ith component process has correlation time τ_{ii}, whereas in the limit $\tau_{ii} \to 0$ (for all i) the process $\boldsymbol{h}_t^0$ converges to the white noise. For detailed properties of harmonic noise process, see for instance [22] or the Appendix in [23]. We remark that the use of harmonic noise as the driving non-Markovian colored noise in the SIDE (1) is a natural choice that models the environment as a bath of damped harmonic oscillators. It is simpler to analyze compared to the general multiscale colored noises considered in Section 2.3 of [24]. The resulting SIDE for the second sub-class reads:

$$m\ddot{\boldsymbol{x}}_t = \boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{x}_t) - \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)\int_0^t \boldsymbol{\kappa}_2(t-s)\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_s)\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_s ds + \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)\boldsymbol{h}_t^0. \tag{7}$$

Remark II.1. The SIDEs (4) and (7) belong to a special class of non-Markovian equations, the so-called quasi-Markovian Langevin equations [25]. For these equations one can introduce a finite number of auxiliary variables in such a way that the evolution of particle's position and velocity, together with these auxiliary variables, is described by a usual SDE system and is thus Markovian. We remark that such "Markovianization" procedure works because the colored noise can be generated by a system of SDEs and the memory kernel satisfies a linear ODE (of finite order). If, on the other hand, the memory kernel decays algebraically, then there is no finite dimensional extension of the space which would make the solution process Markovian [12].

In cases of particular interest in statistical physics, $\boldsymbol{g}$ is proportional to $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ ($\boldsymbol{g} \propto \boldsymbol{\sigma}$), with the proportionality factor dependent on the temperature T of the environment. We also have

$$E[\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^0(\boldsymbol{\eta}_s^0)^*] = \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\kappa}_1(|t-s|)$$

for the first sub-class and

$$E[\boldsymbol{h}_t^0(\boldsymbol{h}_s^0)^*] = \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\kappa}_2(|t-s|)$$

for the second sub-class. In such cases, the SIDEs (4) and (7) describe a particle interacting with an equilibrium heat bath at a temperature T, whose dynamics satisfy the fluctuation-dissipation relation [26], [27].

B. Homogenization of SIDEs: Discussions and Problem Statement

There are three characteristic time scales defining the non-Markovian dynamics described by the SIDE (1):

- the inertial time scale, λ_m, defined as the relaxation time of the particle velocity process $\boldsymbol{v}_t := \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_t$. The limit $\lambda_m \to 0$ is equivalent to the limit $m \to 0$;
- the memory time scale, λ_κ, defined as the inverse rate of exponential decay of the memory kernel $\boldsymbol{\kappa}(t-s)$;
- the noise correlation time scale, λ_ξ.

For the purpose of multiscale analysis, we set $m = m_0\epsilon^\mu$, $\lambda_\kappa = \tau_\kappa\epsilon^\theta$ and $\lambda_\xi = \tau_\xi\epsilon^\nu$, where $\epsilon > 0$ is a parameter which will be taken to zero and μ, θ, ν are positive constants (exponents), specifying the rates at which the time scales $\lambda_m, \lambda_\kappa, \lambda_\xi$ vanish respectively.

With these substitutions, the SIDE (4) becomes (with $\boldsymbol{A}$ in the formula for $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_1$ replaced by $\boldsymbol{A}/(\tau_\kappa\epsilon^\theta)$, $\boldsymbol{A}$ in (2) replaced by $\boldsymbol{A}/(\tau_\eta\epsilon^\nu)$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^0$ replaced by $\boldsymbol{\eta}_t$):

$$m_0\epsilon^\mu\ddot{\boldsymbol{x}}_t = \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)\boldsymbol{\eta}_t - \frac{\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)}{\tau_\kappa\epsilon^\theta}\int_0^t \boldsymbol{A}e^{-\frac{\boldsymbol{A}}{\tau_\kappa\epsilon^\theta}(t-s)}\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_s)\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_s ds + \boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{x}_t), \tag{8}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\eta}_t$ is the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process with the correlation time $\tau_\eta\epsilon^\nu$, i.e. it is a rescaled process satisfying the SDE:

$$d\boldsymbol{\eta}_t = -\frac{\boldsymbol{A}}{\tau_\eta\epsilon^\nu}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t dt + \frac{\boldsymbol{A}}{\tau_\eta\epsilon^\nu}d\boldsymbol{W}_t, \tag{9}$$

and the SIDE (7) becomes (with $\boldsymbol{\tau} := \tau_\kappa\epsilon^\theta$ in the formula for $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_2$, $\boldsymbol{h}_t^0$, $\boldsymbol{u}_t^0$ replaced by $\boldsymbol{h}_t$, $\boldsymbol{u}_t$ respectively and $\boldsymbol{\tau} := \tau_h\epsilon^\nu$ in (5)-(6)) :

$$\begin{aligned} m_0\epsilon^\mu\ddot{\boldsymbol{x}}_t &= \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)\boldsymbol{h}_t + \boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{x}_t) \\ &\quad - \frac{\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)}{\tau_\kappa\epsilon^\theta}\int_0^t e^{-\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2\frac{(t-s)}{2\tau_\kappa\epsilon^\theta}}\left[\cos\left(\frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}_0}{\tau_\kappa\epsilon^\theta}(t-s)\right) + \frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}_1}{2}\sin\left(\frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}_0}{\tau_\kappa\epsilon^\theta}(t-s)\right)\right]\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_s)\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_s ds, \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where $\boldsymbol{h}_t$ is the harmonic noise process with the correlation time $\tau_h\epsilon^\nu$, i.e. it is a rescaled process satisfying the SDE system:

$$d\boldsymbol{h}_t = \frac{1}{\tau_h\epsilon^\nu}\boldsymbol{u}_t dt, \tag{11}$$

$$d\boldsymbol{u}_t = -\frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2}{\tau_h\epsilon^\nu}\boldsymbol{u}_t dt - \frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2}{\tau_h\epsilon^\nu}\boldsymbol{h}_t dt + \frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2}{\tau_h\epsilon^\nu}d\boldsymbol{W}_t. \tag{12}$$

Both SIDEs have the initial conditions $\boldsymbol{x}_0 = \boldsymbol{x}$, $\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_0 = \boldsymbol{v}$. The initial conditions $\boldsymbol{\eta}_0$ (respectively, $\boldsymbol{h}_0$ and $\boldsymbol{u}_0$) are distributed according to the stationary measure of the SDE that the process $\boldsymbol{\eta}_t$ (respectively, $\boldsymbol{h}_t$ and $\boldsymbol{u}_t$) satisfies.

In this paper we set $\mu = \theta = \nu$, which corresponds to the case when all the characteristic time scales are of comparable magnitude so that this leads to a non-trivial limit as $\epsilon \to 0$. Our main goal is to derive a limiting equation for the (slow) $\boldsymbol{x}$ component of the processes solving the equations (8)-(9) and the equations (10)-(12), in the limit $\epsilon \to 0$, in a strong pathwise sense.

We explain the motivation behind the above rescalings. The rescaling of the memory kernels $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_1(t-s)$ and $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_2(t-s)$ is such that in the limit $\epsilon \to 0$ the rescaled memory kernels converge to $\delta(t)\boldsymbol{I}$ formally, where $\delta(t)$ is the Dirac-delta function and $\boldsymbol{I}$ is a $d \times d$ identity matrix. On the other hand, the rescaled noise processes $\boldsymbol{\eta}_t$ and $\boldsymbol{h}_t$ converge to the white noise process in the limit $\epsilon \to 0$.

C. Assumptions

Let $\boldsymbol{x}_t, \boldsymbol{X}_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for $t \in [0, T]$, where $T > 0$ is a finite constant, $\boldsymbol{W}_t$ be an $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued Wiener process on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_t, P)$ satisfying the usual conditions [28]. Here $\mathcal{F}_t$ is the usual augmentation of $\sigma(\{\boldsymbol{W}_s : s \le t\})$, the σ-algebra generated by $\boldsymbol{W}$ up to time t. Throughout the paper, we denote the position component of the pre-limit equation by small letter $\boldsymbol{x}_t$ and that of the limiting equation by a capital letter $\boldsymbol{X}_t$.

Here and in the following, we use Einstein summation convention and $*$ denotes the transposition of a matrix. The Euclidean norm of an arbitrary vector $\boldsymbol{w}$ is denoted by $|\boldsymbol{w}|$ and the (induced operator) norm of a matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ by $\|\boldsymbol{A}\|$.

We make the following assumptions.

Assumption 1. The force field $\boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{x})$ and the matrix-valued coefficients $\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x})$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{x})$ are real-valued, continuously differentiable functions in the variable $\boldsymbol{x}$, hence bounded on any compact interval $[0,T]$, i.e. $\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{g},\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in C_b^1$. Moreover, we assume that the Jacobian matrices of $\boldsymbol{g}$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ are bounded.

Assumption 2. The matrix $\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x})$ is positive stable, i.e. all eigenvalues of the matrix $\boldsymbol{g}$ have positive real parts, uniformly in $\boldsymbol{x}$.

Assumption 3. The initial conditions $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ are random variables independent of the σ-algebra generated by $\boldsymbol{W}_t$. They are chosen independently of the small parameter ϵ. We assume that they have finite moments of all orders, i.e. $E[|\boldsymbol{x}|^p], E[|\boldsymbol{v}|^p]<\infty$ for all $p>0$.

Assumption 4. There are no explosions, i.e. almost surely, there exists global unique solution on the compact time interval $[0,T]$ for any values of the parameter ϵ to the pre-limit equations and also to the limiting equations.

Throughout the paper, the generic symbols, such as C and T, do not need to have the same values in all equations and inequalities. The convergence of the solution, $\boldsymbol{x}_t$, of the pre-limit equation to the solution, $\boldsymbol{X}_t$, of the limiting equation will be obtained in the L^p norm, with respect to the topology on the space of continuous paths on the compact time interval $[0,T]$ with the uniform metric, i.e. we show that, as ϵ tends to zero,

$$E\left[\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|\boldsymbol{x}_t-\boldsymbol{X}_t|^p\right]\to 0,$$

for $p>0$.

III. SMOLUCHOWSKI-KRAMERS LIMIT OF SDE'S REVISITED

Let $\boldsymbol{x}_t,\boldsymbol{v}_t\in\mathbb{R}^n$, where $t\in[0,T]$. Consider the $2n$-dimensional SDE:

$$d\boldsymbol{x}_t=\boldsymbol{v}_t dt, \tag{13}$$

$$m d\boldsymbol{v}_t=\boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)dt-\boldsymbol{\gamma}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)\boldsymbol{v}_t dt+\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)d\boldsymbol{W}_t, \tag{14}$$

where $\boldsymbol{F}:\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}^n$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}:\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ is a $n\times n$ invertible matrix-valued function, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}:\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}^{n\times k}$, $\boldsymbol{W}$ is a k-dimensional Wiener process and $m>0$ is the mass of the particle. The initial conditions are given by $\boldsymbol{x}_0=\boldsymbol{x}$, $\boldsymbol{v}_0=\boldsymbol{v}$. The above SDEs model diffusive phenomena in systems where the damping and diffusion coefficients are state-dependent.

The Smoluchowski-Kramers limit (or the small mass limit) of the system described by (13)-(14) has been studied in [1] (see also [29], [30] and the recent works [31], [32]). The main results of these works say that, under certain assumptions, the $\boldsymbol{x}$-component of the solution to SDEs (13)-(14) converges (in a strong pathwise sense), as $m\to 0$, to the solution of a homogenized SDE that contains a drift correction term, the so-called noise-induced drift, that was not present in the pre-limit SDEs. The presence of such noise-induced drift in the homogenized equation is a consequence of the state-dependence of the damping and

diffusion coefficients. For an overview of the noise-induced drift phenomena, we refer to the review article [33].

In all the works in [1], [30], [31], [32], the spectral assumption made on the matrix $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ was that the smallest eigenvalue of its symmetric part $\frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}+\boldsymbol{\gamma}^*)$ is positive uniformly in $\boldsymbol{x}$ or that it is positive definite. The same results can be obtained under a weaker assumption that matrix $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is positive stable, i.e. all real parts of the eigenvalues of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ are positive uniformly in $\boldsymbol{x}$ [34]. To simplify the analysis, we assume boundedness of the coefficients in the SDEs as in [1]. More precisely, we make the following assumptions.

Assumption 5. The coefficients $\boldsymbol{F}$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ are bounded, continuously differentiable functions, i.e. they are C_b^1 functions. Moreover, the Jacobian matrix of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is bounded.

Assumption 6. The matrix $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is uniformly positive stable, i.e. all real parts of the eigenvalues of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ are bounded below by some constant $2\kappa > 0$, uniformly in $\boldsymbol{x}$.

Assumption 7. The initial conditions $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ are random variables independent of ϵ and have finite moments of all orders, i.e. $E[|\boldsymbol{x}|^p], E[|\boldsymbol{v}|^p] < \infty$ for all $p > 0$.

Assumption 8. The global solutions, defined on $[0, T]$, to the pre-limit SDEs (13)-(14) and the limiting SDE a.s. exist and are unique for all $\epsilon > 0$ (i.e. there are no explosions).

We now state the result.

Theorem III.1. Suppose that the SDE system (13)-(14) satisfies Assumption 5-8. Let $(\boldsymbol{x}_t, \boldsymbol{v}_t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ be its solution, with initial condition $(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{v})$. Let $\boldsymbol{X}_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the solution to the following (Itô) SDE with initial position $\boldsymbol{X}_0 = \boldsymbol{x}$:

$$d\boldsymbol{X}_t = [\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{X}_t)\boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{X}_t) + \boldsymbol{S}(\boldsymbol{X}_t)]dt + \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{X}_t)\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{X}_t)d\boldsymbol{W}_t, \tag{15}$$

where $\boldsymbol{S}(\boldsymbol{X}_t)$ is the noise-induced drift whose ith component is given by

$$S_i(\boldsymbol{X}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial X_l}[(\gamma^{-1})_{ij}(\boldsymbol{X})]J_{jl}(\boldsymbol{X}), \quad i, j, l = 1, \ldots, n,$$

where $\boldsymbol{J}$ is the unique matrix solving the Lyapunov equation

$$\boldsymbol{J}\boldsymbol{\gamma}^* + \boldsymbol{\gamma}\boldsymbol{J} = \boldsymbol{\sigma}\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*. \tag{16}$$

Then the process $\boldsymbol{x}_t$ converges, as $m \to 0$, to the solution $\boldsymbol{X}_t$, of the (Itô) SDE (15), in the following sense: for all $T > 0$, $p > 0$, $0 < \beta < p/2$, we have

$$E\left[\sup_{t\in[0,T]} |\boldsymbol{x}_t - \boldsymbol{X}_t|^p\right] = O(m^\beta),$$

as $m \to 0$.

Despite the relaxed spectral assumption on $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, the techniques used to prove the above convergence result are identical to the one provided in previous works: [1], [31] and [32]. Therefore, we will simply review the essential ingredients for the proof of Theorem III.1 and point out the needed modifications along the way. The readers are invited to refer to these works for more technical details.

A. Derivation of Limiting SDE

We start by rewriting SDE (14) as

$$\boldsymbol{v}_t dt = -m\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)d\boldsymbol{v}_t + \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)\boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)dt + \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)d\boldsymbol{W}_t.$$

The integral form of the above is given by

$$\boldsymbol{x}_t = \boldsymbol{x} - m\int_0^t \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x}_s)d\boldsymbol{v}_s + \int_0^t \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x}_s)\boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{x}_s)ds + \int_0^t \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x}_s)\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{x}_s)d\boldsymbol{W}_s.$$

We are interested in the limit as $m \to 0$ of the process $\boldsymbol{x}_t$. Only the first integral in the above formula has an explicit dependence on m, so we need to examine its asymptotic behavior when m becomes small. Integrating by parts in its second term, we can write its ith component as:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^t (\gamma^{-1})_{ij}(\boldsymbol{x}_s)d(m\boldsymbol{v}_s)_j = (\gamma^{-1})_{ij}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)m(v_t)_j - (\gamma^{-1})_{ij}(\boldsymbol{x})mv_j \\ - \int_0^t \frac{\partial}{\partial x_l}[(\gamma^{-1})_{ij}(\boldsymbol{x}_s)]m(v_s)_j(v_s)_l ds,\end{aligned}$$

where the product $m(v_s)_j(v_s)_l$ is the (j,l)-entry of the matrix $m\boldsymbol{v}_s\boldsymbol{v}_s^*$.

We now examine the asymptotic behavior of the above expression in the limit as $m \to 0$. Following [1], we express the matrix $m\boldsymbol{v}_s\boldsymbol{v}_s^*$, $s \in [0,t]$, as a solution to an equation by applying Itô's formula to the matrix $(m\boldsymbol{v}_s)(m\boldsymbol{v}_s^*)$. This leads to:

$$d[(m\boldsymbol{v}_s)(m\boldsymbol{v}_s^*)] = -[\boldsymbol{\gamma}(\boldsymbol{x}_s)(m\boldsymbol{v}_s\boldsymbol{v}_s^* ds) + (m\boldsymbol{v}_s\boldsymbol{v}_s^* ds)\boldsymbol{\gamma}^*(\boldsymbol{x}_s)] + \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{x}_s)\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*(\boldsymbol{x}_s)ds + d\boldsymbol{U}_s + d\boldsymbol{U}_s^*,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}d\boldsymbol{U}_s &= (\boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{x}_s)ds + \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{x}_s)d\boldsymbol{W}_s)m\boldsymbol{v}_s^*, \\ d\boldsymbol{U}_s^* &= m\boldsymbol{v}_s(\boldsymbol{F}^*(\boldsymbol{x}_s)ds + d\boldsymbol{W}_s^*\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*(\boldsymbol{x}_s)).\end{aligned}$$

Denoting $m\boldsymbol{v}_s\boldsymbol{v}_s^*ds$ by $\boldsymbol{V}$, $-\boldsymbol{\gamma}(\boldsymbol{x}_s)$ by $\boldsymbol{Q}$ and letting

$$\boldsymbol{C} := d[(m\boldsymbol{v}_s)(m\boldsymbol{v}_s^*)] - \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{x}_s)\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*(\boldsymbol{x}_s)ds - d\boldsymbol{U}_s - d\boldsymbol{U}_s^*,$$

we can write the above equation as the following Lyapunov equation

$$\boldsymbol{Q}\boldsymbol{V} + \boldsymbol{V}\boldsymbol{Q}^* = \boldsymbol{C}.$$

By Assumption 6, all real parts of the eigenvalues of $\boldsymbol{Q}$ are negative, thus the Lyapunov equation has a unique solution given by:

$$\boldsymbol{V} = -\int_0^\infty e^{\boldsymbol{Q}y}\boldsymbol{C}e^{\boldsymbol{Q}^*y}dy.$$

Writing this out explicitly, we obtain:

$$m\boldsymbol{v}_s\boldsymbol{v}_s^* ds = -\int_0^\infty e^{-\boldsymbol{\gamma}(\boldsymbol{x}_s)y} d[(m\boldsymbol{v}_s)(m\boldsymbol{v}_s^*)] e^{-\boldsymbol{\gamma}^*(\boldsymbol{x}_s)y} dy \tag{17}$$

$$+\int_0^\infty e^{-\boldsymbol{\gamma}(\boldsymbol{x}_s)y} (\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{x}_s)\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*(\boldsymbol{x}_s) ds) e^{-\boldsymbol{\gamma}^*(\boldsymbol{x}_s)y} dy \tag{18}$$

$$+\int_0^\infty e^{-\boldsymbol{\gamma}(\boldsymbol{x}_s)y} (d\boldsymbol{U}_s + d\boldsymbol{U}_s^*) e^{-\boldsymbol{\gamma}^*(\boldsymbol{x}_s)y} dy. \tag{19}$$

Based on the prior result in [1], we expect that only the second term on the right hand side has a nonzero limit as $m \to 0$. The other terms are expected to vanish as $m \to 0$. Thus, in the limit $m \to 0$, we expect that $m\boldsymbol{v}_t\boldsymbol{v}_t^*$ converges to the solution, $\boldsymbol{J}$, of the following Lyapunov equation:

$$\boldsymbol{J}\boldsymbol{\gamma}^* + \boldsymbol{\gamma}\boldsymbol{J} = \boldsymbol{\sigma}\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*,$$

given in the statement of Theorem III.1 (see eqn. (16)).

B. Moment Estimates and Proof of Convergence

To justify the above convergence arguments, we provide estimates on the pth moment of the momentum process $\boldsymbol{p}_t := m\boldsymbol{v}_t$ and the process $m\boldsymbol{v_t}\boldsymbol{v_t^*}$, in the limit $m \to 0$. First, we state the following lemma, adapted from Proposition A.2.3 of [35], to obtain an exponential bound on certain fundamental matrix solution.

Lemma 1. Let $\boldsymbol{B}(t)$ be a bounded, continuous, $\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$-valued process defined on a compact time interval $[0, T]$ such that all real parts of the eigenvalues of $\boldsymbol{B}(t)$ are bounded from above by -2κ, where κ is a positive constant. Let $\boldsymbol{\Phi}(t, s)$ be the fundamental matrix that solves the initial value problem (IVP):

$$\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Phi}(t,s)}{\partial t} = \frac{\boldsymbol{B}(t)}{\epsilon}\boldsymbol{\Phi}(t,s), \quad \boldsymbol{\Phi}(s,s) = \boldsymbol{I}, \quad 0 \le s \le t \le T. \tag{20}$$

Then there exists a constant C and a constant $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\Phi}(t,s)\| \le Ce^{-\kappa(t-s)/\epsilon}$$

for all $\epsilon \le \epsilon_0$ and for all $s, t \in [0, T]$.

The exponential bound above is due to the fact that IVP (20) is a singular perturbation problem on a compact time interval, so $\boldsymbol{B}(t)$ becomes a slowly varying process after time-stretching. Had ϵ been fixed, we generally could not obtain such an exponential bound and, in fact, $\boldsymbol{\Phi}(t, s)$ could even grow exponentially in time (see for instance, page 26-27 of [35]). We will use Lemma 1 to obtain a bound on a class of stochastic integrals by modifying Lemma 5.1 in [31] as follows.

Lemma 2. Let $\boldsymbol{H}_t := \boldsymbol{H}_0 + \boldsymbol{M}_t + \boldsymbol{A}_t$ be the Doob-Meyer decomposition of a continuous $\mathbb{R}^k$-valued semimartingale on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_t, P)$ with a local martingale $\boldsymbol{M}_t$ and a process of locally bounded variation $\boldsymbol{A}_t$. Let $\boldsymbol{V} \in L^1_{loc}(A) \cap L^2_{loc}(M)$ be $\mathbb{R}^{n\times k}$-valued and let $\boldsymbol{B}(t)$ be an adapted process whose values are n by n matrices, satisfying the assumptions of Lemma

1. Let $\mathbf{\Phi}(t) := \mathbf{\Phi}(t,0)$ be the adapted C^1 process that pathwise solves the IVP (20). Then for every $T \geq \delta > 0$ and for every $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, we have the P-a.s bound:

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \left\| \mathbf{\Phi}(t) \int_0^t \mathbf{\Phi}^{-1}(s) \boldsymbol{V}_s d\boldsymbol{H}_s \right\| \leq C \left(1 + \frac{4}{\kappa} \sup_{s\in[0,T]} \|\boldsymbol{B}(s)\| \right) \left(e^{-\kappa\delta/\epsilon} \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \left\| \int_0^t \boldsymbol{V}_r d\boldsymbol{H}_r \right\| + \max_{k=0,1,\ldots,N-1} \sup_{t\in[k\delta,(k+2)\delta]} \left\| \int_{k\delta}^t \boldsymbol{V}_r d\boldsymbol{H}_r \right\| \right),$$

where $N = \max\{k \in \mathbb{Z} : k\delta < T\}$, ϵ_0, κ and C are constants from Lemma 1 and l_2-norm is used on every $\mathbb{R}^k$.

Proof. The proof is identical to that of Lemma 5.1 in [31] up to line (5.10), with the constant α there replaced by κ, etc. We let $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$ and replace the bound in line (5.11) there by the following bound due to the semigroup property of fundamental matrix process and Lemma 1:

$$\|\mathbf{\Phi}(t)\mathbf{\Phi}^{-1}(s)\| = \|\mathbf{\Phi}(t,0)\mathbf{\Phi}(0,s)\| = \|\mathbf{\Phi}(t,s)\| \leq Ce^{-\kappa(t-s)/\epsilon}.$$

Then we proceed as in the proof of Lemma 5.1 in [31] to get the desired bound. □

Lemma 2 ensures that conclusion of the Proposition 5.1 of [31], which provides an estimate on the momentum process $\boldsymbol{p}_t := m\boldsymbol{v}_t$, holds under present assumptions. For completeness, we state it here.

Proposition 1. For all $p > 0$, $T > 0$, $0 < \beta < p/2$, we have

$$E\left[\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|\boldsymbol{p}_t\|^p \right] = O(m^\beta)$$

as $m \to 0$. Therefore, for any $p > 0$, $T > 0$, $\beta > 0$, we have

$$E\left[\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|m\boldsymbol{v}_t\boldsymbol{v}_t^*\|^p \right] = O(m^{-\beta}),$$

as $m \to 0$.

We remark that the stronger decay result obtained in Proposition 5.2 of [31] is no longer valid when the matrix $\boldsymbol{\gamma}+\boldsymbol{\gamma}^*$ is not positive definite but this stronger result is not necessary for our proof of convergence on compact time intervals.

We also need the following estimate on a class of integrals with respect to products of the components of the momentum process $\boldsymbol{p}_t = m\boldsymbol{v}_t$. The estimate is a modification (due to our remark in the previous paragraph) of the one given in Proposition 2.3 in [32].

Proposition 2. Let $h(\boldsymbol{x}_s) : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be a C_b^1 function on $[0,T]$, with bounded first derivative $\boldsymbol{\nabla}_{\boldsymbol{x}} h(\boldsymbol{x})$ on $[0,T]$. Then for any $p > 0$, $T > 0$, $0 < \beta < p/2$, $i,j = 1,\ldots,n$, we have

$$E\left[\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \left| \int_0^t h(\boldsymbol{x}_s) d((p_s)_i (p_s)_j) \right|^p \right] = O(m^\beta),$$

as $m \to 0$. Here i,j denote the components of the momentum process $\boldsymbol{p}_t$ in the standard basis for $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Using all the above moment estimates, one can obtain the convergence of $\boldsymbol{x}_t$ to $\boldsymbol{X}_t$ in the limit as $m \to 0$ stated in Theorem III.1, by using the proof techniques in [31] and [32].

IV. HOMOGENIZATION FOR NON-MARKOVIAN MODELS

We now return to the two sub-classes of SIDE (1) introduced in Section II. In this section, we study the effective dynamics described by SIDEs (8) and (10) in the limit as $\epsilon \to 0$. As stated in Section II B, we assume that all the characteristic time scales vanish at the same rate, so without loss of generality, we may set $\mu = \theta = \nu = 1$. We perform the analysis for the first sub-class described by SIDE (8) in detail. The analysis for the second sub-class described by SIDE (10) is done using similar techniques and we omit some details.

A. SIDEs Driven by a Markovian Colored Noise

In view of Remark II.1, the Langevin equations (8)-(9) can be cast as the system of SDEs for the Markov process $(\boldsymbol{x}_t, \boldsymbol{v}_t, \boldsymbol{z}_t, \boldsymbol{y}_t, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_t) \in \mathbb{R}^{6d}$:

$$\begin{aligned} d\boldsymbol{x}_t &= \boldsymbol{v}_t dt, \\ m_0\epsilon d\boldsymbol{v}_t &= \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)\boldsymbol{\eta}_t dt - \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)\boldsymbol{y}_t dt + \boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)dt, \\ d\boldsymbol{z}_t &= \boldsymbol{y}_t dt, \\ \tau_\kappa \epsilon d\boldsymbol{y}_t &= -\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{y}_t dt + \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)\boldsymbol{v}_t dt, \\ d\boldsymbol{\zeta}_t &= \boldsymbol{\eta}_t dt, \\ \tau_\eta \epsilon d\boldsymbol{\eta}_t &= -\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t dt + \boldsymbol{A} d\boldsymbol{W}_t, \end{aligned}$$

where we have defined the auxiliary process

$$\boldsymbol{y}_t := \frac{\boldsymbol{A}}{\tau_\kappa \epsilon} \int_0^t e^{-\frac{\boldsymbol{A}}{\tau_\kappa \epsilon}(t-s)} \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_s)\boldsymbol{v}_s ds.$$

We denote $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_t := [\boldsymbol{x}_t \;\; \boldsymbol{z}_t \;\; \boldsymbol{\zeta}_t]^*$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}_t := [\boldsymbol{v}_t \;\; \boldsymbol{y}_t \;\; \boldsymbol{\eta}_t]^*$ (recall that $*$ denotes transpose, so $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_t$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}_t$ are column vectors) and rewrite the above SDE system in the form (13)-(14):

$$d\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_t = \hat{\boldsymbol{v}}_t dt, \tag{21}$$

$$\epsilon d\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}_t = -\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}_t dt + \hat{\boldsymbol{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)dt + \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)d\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}_t, \tag{22}$$

with

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(\boldsymbol{x}_t) = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{0} & \frac{\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)}{m_0} & -\frac{\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)}{m_0} \\ -\frac{\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)}{\tau_\kappa} & \frac{\boldsymbol{A}}{\tau_\kappa} & \boldsymbol{0} \\ \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{0} & \frac{\boldsymbol{A}}{\tau_\eta} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}_t) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)}{m_0} \\ \boldsymbol{0} \\ \boldsymbol{0} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}(\boldsymbol{x}_t) = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{0} \\ \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{0} \\ \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{0} & \frac{\boldsymbol{A}}{\tau_\eta} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \in \mathbb{R}^{3d \times 3d}$ are 3 by 3 block matrices with each block a $\mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$-valued matrix, $\boldsymbol{0}$ in $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ is a $d \times d$ zero matrix, while $\boldsymbol{0}$ in $\hat{\boldsymbol{F}}$ denotes a d-dimensional zero vector so that $\hat{\boldsymbol{F}} \in \mathbb{R}^{3d}$. Finally, $\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}$ is a $3d$-dimensional Wiener process.

To obtain the effective evolution of $\boldsymbol{x}_t$ in the limit $\epsilon \to 0$, we apply Theorem III.1 to (21)-(22). We have to show that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ is positive stable (uniformly in $\boldsymbol{x}$). We include a linear

algebra lemma that provides a sufficient condition for positive stability in Appendix **B** (see Lemma 3).

The following convergence result is one of the two main results of the paper. It provides a homogenized SDE for the particle position in the limit as the inertial time scale, the memory time scale and the noise correlation time scale vanish at the same rate in the case when the pre-limit dynamics are driven by an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck noise.

Theorem IV.1. Let $\boldsymbol{x}_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the solution to the SDEs (8)-(9), with the matrix $\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x})$ positive definite uniformly in $\boldsymbol{x}$ and commuting with the diagonal matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$. Suppose that Assumptions 1-4 are satisfied. Let $\mu = \theta = \nu$ in (8)-(9). Then as $\epsilon \to 0$, the process $\boldsymbol{x}_t$ converges to the solution, $\boldsymbol{X}_t$, of the following (Itô) SDE:

$$d\boldsymbol{X}_t = \boldsymbol{S}(\boldsymbol{X}_t)dt + \boldsymbol{g}^{-2}(\boldsymbol{X}_t)\boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{X}_t)dt + \boldsymbol{g}^{-2}(\boldsymbol{X}_t)\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{X}_t)d\boldsymbol{W}_t, \tag{23}$$

with $\boldsymbol{S}(\boldsymbol{X}_t) = \boldsymbol{S}^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{X}_t) + \boldsymbol{S}^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{X}_t) + \boldsymbol{S}^{(3)}(\boldsymbol{X}_t)$, where the $\boldsymbol{S}^{(k)}$ are the noise-induced drifts whose ith components are given by

$$\boldsymbol{S}_i^{(1)} = m_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial x_l}[(\boldsymbol{g}^{-2})_{ij}(\boldsymbol{X})]\boldsymbol{J}_{jl}^{11}(\boldsymbol{X}), \quad i,j,l = 1,\dots,d, \tag{24}$$

$$\boldsymbol{S}_i^{(2)} = -\tau_\kappa \frac{\partial}{\partial x_l}[(\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{g})_{ij}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{X})]\boldsymbol{J}_{jl}^{21}(\boldsymbol{X}), \quad i,j,l = 1,\dots,d, \tag{25}$$

$$\boldsymbol{S}_i^{(3)} = \tau_\eta \frac{\partial}{\partial x_l}[(\boldsymbol{g}^{-2}\boldsymbol{\sigma}\boldsymbol{A}^{-1})_{ij}(\boldsymbol{X})]\boldsymbol{J}_{jl}^{31}(\boldsymbol{X}), \quad i,j,l = 1,\dots,d, \tag{26}$$

induced by the simultaneous vanishing of the inertial time scale, the memory time scale and the noise correlation time scale. Here

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{J}} := \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{J}^{11} & \boldsymbol{J}^{12} & \boldsymbol{J}^{13} \\ \boldsymbol{J}^{21} & \boldsymbol{J}^{22} & \boldsymbol{J}^{23} \\ \boldsymbol{J}^{31} & \boldsymbol{J}^{32} & \boldsymbol{J}^{33} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{3d\times 3d}, \quad \text{with } \boldsymbol{J}^{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}, \quad i,j = 1,\dots,d,$$

is the block matrix solving the Lyapunov equation

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^* + \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\hat{\boldsymbol{J}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^*.$$

The convergence is obtained in the following sense: for all finite T, $p > 0$, $0 < \beta < p/2$,

$$E\left[\sup_{t\in[0,T]} |\boldsymbol{x}_t - \boldsymbol{X}_t|^p\right] = O(\epsilon^\beta),$$

as $\epsilon \to 0$.

Proof. By our assumptions on $\boldsymbol{g}$ and $\boldsymbol{A}$, the block matrix $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ is positive stable by Lemma 3 in Appendix **B**. It is invertible and its inverse can be computed using the following formula for blockwise inversion of a block matrix: provided that $\boldsymbol{S}$ and $\boldsymbol{P} - \boldsymbol{Q}\boldsymbol{S}^{-1}\boldsymbol{R}$ are nonsingular, we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{P} & \boldsymbol{Q} \\ \boldsymbol{R} & \boldsymbol{S} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (\boldsymbol{P} - \boldsymbol{Q}\boldsymbol{S}^{-1}\boldsymbol{R})^{-1} & -(\boldsymbol{P} - \boldsymbol{Q}\boldsymbol{S}^{-1}\boldsymbol{R})^{-1}\boldsymbol{Q}\boldsymbol{S}^{-1} \\ -\boldsymbol{S}^{-1}\boldsymbol{R}(\boldsymbol{P} - \boldsymbol{Q}\boldsymbol{S}^{-1}\boldsymbol{R})^{-1} & \boldsymbol{S}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{S}^{-1}\boldsymbol{R}(\boldsymbol{P} - \boldsymbol{Q}\boldsymbol{S}^{-1}\boldsymbol{R})^{-1}\boldsymbol{Q}\boldsymbol{S}^{-1}, \end{bmatrix}$$

where $\boldsymbol{P}$, $\boldsymbol{Q}$, $\boldsymbol{R}$, $\boldsymbol{S}$ are matrix sub-blocks of arbitrary dimension.

Using this, we obtain:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} m_0(\boldsymbol{g}^{-1})^2 & -\tau_\kappa \boldsymbol{g}^{-1}\boldsymbol{A}^{-1} & \tau_\eta(\boldsymbol{g}^{-1})^2\boldsymbol{\sigma}\boldsymbol{A}^{-1} \\ m_0\boldsymbol{g}^{-1} & \mathbf{0} & \tau_\eta \boldsymbol{g}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}\boldsymbol{A}^{-1} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \tau_\eta \boldsymbol{A}^{-1} \end{bmatrix},$$

As Assumptions 1-4 guarantee that Assumptions 5-8 (with $n := 3d$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ replaced by $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$, $\boldsymbol{F}$ replaced by $\hat{\boldsymbol{F}}$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ replaced by $\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$, etc.) are satisfied, the result follows by applying Theorem III.1 to the SDE systems (21)-(22). □

Corollary IV.2. In the one-dimensional case, $\boldsymbol{X}_t := X_t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{X}) := g(X)$, with $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, etc. (i.e. we drop the bold face when denoting scalar processes) and $\boldsymbol{A} := \alpha > 0$ is a constant. The homogenized equation is given by:

$$dX_t = S(X_t)dt + g^{-2}(X_t)F(X_t)dt + g^{-2}(X_t)\sigma(X_t)dW_t, \tag{27}$$

with $S(X_t) = S^{(1)}(X_t) + S^{(2)}(X_t) + S^{(3)}(X_t)$, where the noise-induced drift terms $S^{(k)}(X_t)$ have the following explicit expressions that depend on the parameters m_0, τ_κ and τ_η:

$$S^{(1)}(X_t) = \left(\frac{1}{g^2(X_t)}\right)' \frac{\sigma(X_t)^2}{2g^2(X_t)} \left[\frac{\tau_\kappa^2 g^2(X_t) + m_0\alpha(\tau_\kappa + \tau_\eta)}{\tau_\eta^2 g^2(X_t) + m_0\alpha(\tau_\kappa + \tau_\eta)}\right], \tag{28}$$

$$S^{(2)}(X_t) = -\left(\frac{1}{g(X_t)}\right)' \frac{\sigma(X_t)^2\tau_\kappa(\tau_\kappa + \tau_\eta)}{2g(X_t)[\tau_\eta^2 g^2(X_t) + m_0\alpha(\tau_\kappa + \tau_\eta)]}, \tag{29}$$

$$S^{(3)}(X_t) = \left(\frac{\sigma(X_t)}{g^2(X_t)}\right)' \frac{\sigma(X_t)\tau_\eta(\tau_\kappa + \tau_\eta)}{2[\tau_\eta^2 g^2(X_t) + m_0\alpha(\tau_\kappa + \tau_\eta)]}, \tag{30}$$

where the prime $'$ denotes derivative with respect to X.

Proof. With $\boldsymbol{x}_t := [x_t \;\; z_t \;\; \zeta_t]^* \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $\boldsymbol{v}_t := [v_t \;\; y_t \;\; \eta_t]^* \in \mathbb{R}^3$, SDEs (21)-(22) become:

$$d\boldsymbol{x}_t = \boldsymbol{v}_t dt, \tag{31}$$

$$\epsilon d\boldsymbol{v}_t = -\boldsymbol{\gamma}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)\boldsymbol{v}_t dt + \boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)dt + \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)d\boldsymbol{W}_t, \tag{32}$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}(\boldsymbol{x}_t) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \frac{g(x_t)}{m_0} & -\frac{\sigma(x_t)}{m_0} \\ -\frac{\alpha}{\tau_\kappa}g(x_t) & \frac{\alpha}{\tau_\kappa} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{\alpha}{\tau_\eta} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{x}_t) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{F(x_t)}{m_0} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{x}_t) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{\alpha}{\tau_\eta} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The eigenvalues of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ are

$$\frac{\alpha}{\tau_\eta}, \; \frac{\alpha}{2\tau_\kappa} \pm \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{\alpha^2 m_0 - 4\alpha g(x_t)^2\tau_\kappa}{m_0\tau_\kappa^2}},$$

and so their real parts are positive. The inverse of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is given by

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x}_t) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{m_0}{g^2} & -\frac{\tau_\kappa}{\alpha g} & \frac{\tau_\eta\sigma}{\alpha g^2} \\ \frac{m_0}{g} & 0 & \frac{\tau_\eta\sigma}{\alpha g} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{\tau_\eta}{\alpha} \end{bmatrix},$$

On the other hand, the solution, $\boldsymbol{J} \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3}$, to the Lyapunov equation,

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}\boldsymbol{J} + \boldsymbol{J}\boldsymbol{\gamma}^* = \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)^*,$$

can be computed (using Mathematica®) to be:

$$\boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{x}_t) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\sigma^2}{2m_0 g^2}\left[\frac{\tau_\kappa^2 g^2 + m_0\alpha(\tau_\kappa+\tau_\eta)}{\tau_\eta^2 g^2 + m_0\alpha(\tau_\kappa+\tau_\eta)}\right] & \frac{\alpha\sigma^2(\tau_\kappa+\tau_\eta)}{2g(\tau_\eta^2 g^2 + m_0\alpha(\tau_\kappa+\tau_\eta)} & \frac{\alpha\sigma(\tau_\kappa+\tau_\eta)}{2(\tau_\eta^2 g^2 + m_0\alpha(\tau_\kappa+\tau_\eta))} \\ \frac{\alpha\sigma^2(\tau_\kappa+\tau_\eta)}{2g(\tau_\eta^2 g^2 + m_0\alpha(\tau_\kappa+\tau_\eta)} & \frac{\alpha\sigma^2(\tau_\kappa+\tau_\eta)}{2(\tau_\eta^2 g^2 + m_0\alpha(\tau_\kappa+\tau_\eta))} & \frac{\tau_\eta\alpha\sigma g}{2(\tau_\eta^2 g^2 + m_0\alpha(\tau_\kappa+\tau_\eta))} \\ \frac{\alpha\sigma(\tau_\kappa+\tau_\eta)}{2(\tau_\eta^2 g^2 + m_0\alpha(\tau_\kappa+\tau_\eta))} & \frac{\tau_\eta\alpha\sigma g}{2(\tau_\eta^2 g^2 + m_0\alpha(\tau_\kappa+\tau_\eta))} & \frac{\alpha}{2\tau_\eta} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The result then follows from Theorem IV.1. □

Remark IV.1. Note that here the matrix $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is not symmetric and the smallest eigenvalue of its symmetric part can be negative. Thus, we cannot apply the main results in [1] to obtain the convergence result. This is in fact our main motivation to revisit the Smoluchowski-Kramers limit of SDEs in Section III under a weakened spectral assumption on the matrix $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ (or $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ for the multidimensional case).

Next, we discuss a particular case when the fluctuation-dissipation relation (i.e. $\tau_\kappa = \tau_\eta$ and $\boldsymbol{g} \propto \boldsymbol{\sigma}$) holds. This is, for instance, the case when the pre-limit dynamics are (heuristically) derived from Hamiltonian dynamics (see Appendix **A**). In this case, the correction drift terms $S^{(2)}$ and $S^{(3)}$ cancel each other and the resulting (single) noise-induced drift term coincides with that obtained in the limit as $m \to 0$ of the systems with no memory, driven by a white noise to which Theorem III.1 applies directly. However, when the relation fails, we obtain three different drift corrections induced by the vanishing of all time scales. The presence of these correction terms may have significant consequences for the dynamics of the systems (see Section V).

B. SIDEs Driven by a Non-Markovian Colored Noise

The Langevin equations (10)-(12) can be cast as a system of SDEs for the Markov process $(\boldsymbol{x}_t, \boldsymbol{v}_t, \boldsymbol{z}_t^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{y}_t^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{z}_t^{(2)}, \boldsymbol{y}_t^{(2)}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_t, \boldsymbol{h}_t, \boldsymbol{w}_t, \boldsymbol{u}_t) \in \mathbb{R}^{10d}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
d\boldsymbol{x}_t &= \boldsymbol{v}_t dt, \\
m_0\epsilon d\boldsymbol{v}_t &= \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)\boldsymbol{h}_t dt - \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)(\boldsymbol{y}_t^{(1)} + \boldsymbol{y}_t^{(2)})dt + \boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)dt, \\
d\boldsymbol{z}_t^{(1)} &= \boldsymbol{y}_t^{(1)} dt, \\
\tau_\kappa\epsilon d\boldsymbol{y}_t^{(1)} &= -\frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2}{2}\boldsymbol{y}_t^{(1)} dt + \left(\frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2}{2} - 2\boldsymbol{I}\right)\boldsymbol{y}_t^{(2)} dt + \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)\boldsymbol{v}_t dt, \\
d\boldsymbol{z}_t^{(2)} &= \boldsymbol{y}_t^{(2)} dt, \\
\tau_\kappa\epsilon d\boldsymbol{y}_t^{(2)} &= -\frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2}{2}\boldsymbol{y}_t^{(2)} dt + \frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2}{2}\boldsymbol{y}_t^{(1)} dt, \\
d\boldsymbol{\zeta}_t &= \boldsymbol{h}_t dt, \\
\tau_h\epsilon d\boldsymbol{h}_t &= \boldsymbol{u}_t dt, \\
d\boldsymbol{w}_t &= \boldsymbol{u}_t dt, \\
\tau_h\epsilon d\boldsymbol{u}_t &= -\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2\boldsymbol{u}_t dt - \boldsymbol{\Omega}^2\boldsymbol{h}_t dt + \boldsymbol{\Omega}^2 d\boldsymbol{W}_t,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have defined the auxiliary processes

$$\boldsymbol{y}_t^{(1)} := \frac{1}{\tau_\kappa \epsilon}\int_0^t e^{-\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2\frac{(t-s)}{2\tau_\kappa\epsilon}}\cos\left(\frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}_0}{\tau_\kappa\epsilon}(t-s)\right)\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_s)\boldsymbol{v}_s ds$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{y}_t^{(2)} := \frac{1}{\tau_\kappa \epsilon}\int_0^t e^{-\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2\frac{(t-s)}{2\tau_\kappa\epsilon}}\frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}_1}{2}\sin\left(\frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}_0}{\tau_\kappa\epsilon}(t-s)\right)\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_s)\boldsymbol{v}_s ds.$$

We denote $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_t := [\boldsymbol{x}_t \;\; \boldsymbol{z}_t^{(1)} \;\; \boldsymbol{z}_t^{(2)} \;\; \boldsymbol{\zeta}_t \;\; \boldsymbol{w}_t]^*$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}_t := [\boldsymbol{v}_t \;\; \boldsymbol{y}_t^{(1)} \;\; \boldsymbol{y}_t^{(2)} \;\; \boldsymbol{h}_t \;\; \boldsymbol{u}_t]^*$ and rewrite the above SDE system in the form (13)-(14):

$$d\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_t = \hat{\boldsymbol{v}}_t dt, \tag{33}$$

$$\epsilon d\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}_t = -\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}_t dt + \hat{\boldsymbol{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)dt + \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)d\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}_t, \tag{34}$$

with

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(\boldsymbol{x}_t) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \frac{\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)}{m_0} & \frac{\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)}{m_0} & -\frac{\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)}{m_0} & \mathbf{0} \\ -\frac{\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)}{\tau_\kappa} & \frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2}{2\tau_\kappa} & \frac{2\boldsymbol{I}}{\tau_\kappa} - \frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2}{2\tau_\kappa} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & -\frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2}{2\tau_\kappa} & \frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2}{2\tau_\kappa} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & -\frac{1}{\tau_h}\boldsymbol{I} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2}{\tau_h} & \frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2}{\tau_h} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}_t) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)}{m_0} \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}(\boldsymbol{x}_t) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2}{\tau_h} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \in \mathbb{R}^{5d\times 5d}$ are 5 by 5 block matrices with each block a $\mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$-valued matrix, $\boldsymbol{I}$ is a $d \times d$ identity matrix, $\mathbf{0}$ in $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ is a $d \times d$ zero matrix, while $\mathbf{0}$ in $\hat{\boldsymbol{F}}$ denotes a d-dimensional zero vector so that $\hat{\boldsymbol{F}} \in \mathbb{R}^{5d}$. Finally, $\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}$ is a $5d$-dimensional Wiener process.

Repeating the analysis as before, one can derive a homogenized SDE for the particle position in the limit, in which the inertial time scale, the memory time scale and the noise correlation time scale vanish at the same rate in the case when the pre-limit dynamics are driven by the harmonic noise. This is our second main result. We emphasize that in this case the original system is driven by a noise which is not a Markov process.

Theorem IV.3. Let $\boldsymbol{x}_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the solution to the SDEs (10)-(12), with the matrix $\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x})$ positive definite uniformly in $\boldsymbol{x}$ and commuting with the diagonal matrix $\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2$. Suppose that Assumptions 1-4 are satisfied. Let $\mu = \theta = \nu$ in (10)-(12). Then as $\epsilon \to 0$, the process $\boldsymbol{x}_t$ converges to the solution, $\boldsymbol{X}_t$, of the following (Itô) SDE

$$d\boldsymbol{X}_t = \boldsymbol{S}(\boldsymbol{X}_t)dt + \boldsymbol{g}^{-2}(\boldsymbol{X}_t)\boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{X}_t)dt + \boldsymbol{g}^{-2}(\boldsymbol{X}_t)\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{X}_t)d\boldsymbol{W}_t, \tag{35}$$

with $\boldsymbol{S}(\boldsymbol{X}_t) = \boldsymbol{S}^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{X}_t) + \boldsymbol{S}^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{X}_t) + \boldsymbol{S}^{(3)}(\boldsymbol{X}_t)$, where the $\boldsymbol{S}^{(k)}$ are the noise-induced drift

terms whose ith components equal

$$\boldsymbol{S}_i^{(1)} = m_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial x_l}[(\boldsymbol{g}^{-2})_{ij}(\boldsymbol{X})]\boldsymbol{J}_{jl}^{11}(\boldsymbol{X}), \tag{36}$$

$$\boldsymbol{S}_i^{(2)} = -\tau_\kappa \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_l}[(\boldsymbol{g}^{-1})_{ij}(\boldsymbol{X})]\boldsymbol{J}_{jl}^{21}(\boldsymbol{X}) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_l}[(\boldsymbol{g}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{I} - 2\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{-2}))_{ij}(\boldsymbol{X})]\boldsymbol{J}_{jl}^{31}(\boldsymbol{X}) \right), \tag{37}$$

$$\boldsymbol{S}_i^{(3)} = \tau_h \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_l}[(\boldsymbol{g}^{-2}\boldsymbol{\sigma})_{ij}(\boldsymbol{X})]\boldsymbol{J}_{jl}^{41}(\boldsymbol{X}) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_l}[(\boldsymbol{g}^{-2}\boldsymbol{\sigma}\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{-2})_{ij}(\boldsymbol{X})]\boldsymbol{J}_{jl}^{51}(\boldsymbol{X}) \right), \quad i,j,l = 1,\dots,d. \tag{38}$$

These drift terms are induced by the simultaneous vanishing of the inertial time scale, the memory time scale and the noise correlation time scale, and

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{J}} := \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{J}^{11} & \dots & \boldsymbol{J}^{15} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{J}^{51} & \dots & \boldsymbol{J}^{55} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{5d\times 5d}, \quad \text{with } \boldsymbol{J}^{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}, \quad i,j = 1,\dots,d,$$

is the block matrix solving the Lyapunov equation

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^* + \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\hat{\boldsymbol{J}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^*.$$

The convergence is obtained in the same sense as in the previous case: for all finite T, $p > 0$, $0 < \beta < p/2$,

$$E\left[\sup_{t\in[0,T]} |\boldsymbol{x}_t - \boldsymbol{X}_t|^p\right] = O(\epsilon^\beta),$$

as $\epsilon \to 0$.

The proof of Theorem IV.3 above is similar to the proof of Theorem IV.1 (with the use of Lemma 4 in Appendix **B** to ensure $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ is positive stable), so we omit it.

Corollary IV.4. In the one-dimensional case, $\boldsymbol{X}_t := X_t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}) := g(x)$, with $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, etc. (i.e. we drop the bold face when denoting scalar processes) and $\boldsymbol{\Omega} := \Omega$ is a constant. The homogenized equation is given by:

$$dX_t = S(X_t)dt + g^{-2}(X_t)F(X_t)dt + g^{-2}(X_t)\sigma(X_t)dW_t, \tag{39}$$

with $S(X_t) = S^{(1)}(X_t) + S^{(2)}(X_t) + S^{(3)}(X_t)$, where the noise-induced drift terms $S^{(k)}(X_t)$ have the following explicit expressions (computed using Mathematica®) that depend on the parameters m_0, τ_κ and τ_h:

$$S^{(1)}(X) = m_0 \left(\frac{1}{g^2(X)}\right)' J^{11}(X), \tag{40}$$

$$S^{(2)}(X) = -\tau_\kappa \left(\frac{1}{g(X)}\right)' \left(J^{21}(X) + \left(1 - \frac{2}{\Omega^2}\right) J^{31}(X)\right), \tag{41}$$

$$S^{(3)}(X) = \tau_h \left(\frac{\sigma(X)}{g^2(X)}\right)' \left(J^{41}(X) + \frac{1}{\Omega^2} J^{51}(X)\right), \tag{42}$$

where the prime $'$ denotes derivative with respect to X and the $J^{ij}(X)$ are given by:

$$J^{11}(X) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2m_0 g^2 R(X)}\Big(g^4\tau_\kappa^4(\tau_\kappa^2+\tau_\kappa\tau_h\Omega^2+\tau_h^2\Omega^2)+m_0^2\Omega^4(\tau_\kappa+\tau_h)^2(\tau_\kappa^2+\tau_h^2 + \tau_\kappa\tau_h(\Omega^2-2))+m_0\Omega^2 g^2(\tau_\kappa+\tau_h)[\tau_h^4+\tau_\kappa^2\tau_h^2(\Omega^2-2)+\tau_\kappa^4(\Omega^2-1) + \tau_\kappa^3\tau_h(2-3\Omega^2+\Omega^4)]\Big),$$

$$J^{21}(X) = \frac{\sigma^2(\tau_\kappa+\tau_h)\Omega^2}{4gR(X)}\Big(m_0\Omega^2(\tau_\kappa+\tau_h)(\tau_\kappa^2+\tau_h^2+\tau_\kappa\tau_h(\Omega^2-2)) + g^2(\tau_\kappa^4+\tau_\kappa^2\tau_h^2+\tau_h^4+\tau_\kappa^3\tau_h(\Omega^2-1))\Big),$$

$$J^{31}(X) = -\frac{\sigma^2(\tau_\kappa+\tau_h)\Omega^2}{4gR(X)}\Big(-m_0\Omega^2(\tau_\kappa+\tau_h)(\tau_\kappa^2+\tau_h^2+\tau_\kappa\tau_h(\Omega^2-2)) + g^2(\tau_\kappa^4+\tau_\kappa^2\tau_h^2-\tau_h^4+\tau_\kappa^3\tau_h(\Omega^2-1))\Big),$$

$$J^{41}(X) = \frac{1}{2}\Big(\sigma\Omega^2(\tau_\kappa+\tau_h)[g^2\tau_h^4+m_0\Omega^2(\tau_\kappa+\tau_h)(\tau_\kappa^2+\tau_h^2+\tau_\kappa\tau_h(\Omega^2-2))]\Big)$$

$$J^{51}(X) = -\frac{1}{2}\Big(\sigma\Omega^2(\tau_\kappa+\tau_h)[m_0\Omega^2(\tau_\kappa+\tau_h)(\tau_\kappa^2+\tau_h^2+\tau_\kappa\tau_h(\Omega^2-2)) - g^2\tau_\kappa\tau_h^2(\tau_\kappa+\tau_h(\Omega^2-1))]\Big),$$

where $g = g(X)$, $\sigma = \sigma(X)$ and

$$R(X) = g^4\tau_h^4(\tau_\kappa^2+\tau_\kappa\tau_h\Omega^2+\tau_h^2\Omega^2)+m_0^2\Omega^4(\tau_\kappa+\tau_h)^2(\tau_\kappa^2+\tau_h^2+\tau_\kappa\tau_h(\Omega^2-2)) + g^2m_0\tau_h^2\Omega^2[\tau_h^3\Omega^2+\tau_\kappa^3(\Omega^2-2)+\tau_\kappa^2\tau_h\Omega^2(\Omega^2-2)+\tau_\kappa\tau_h^2(2-2\Omega^2+\Omega^4)].$$

Note that if we send $\Omega \to \infty$ in the expressions for the $S^{(i)}(X)$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ above, we recover the corresponding expressions given in Corollary IV.2 (with $\alpha = 1$). This is not surprising, since in this limit the harmonic noise becomes an OU process (with $\alpha = 1$).

Moreover, when $\tau_\kappa = \tau_h = \tau$, the noise-induced drift becomes $S(X) = S^{(1)}(X)+S^{(2)}(X)+S^{(3)}(X)$, where

$$S^{(1)} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{g^2}\right)'\frac{\sigma^2}{g^2}, \tag{43}$$

$$S^{(2)} = -\frac{2\tau\Omega^2\sigma^2}{g}\left(\frac{1}{g}\right)'\left(\frac{g^2\tau+m_0\Omega^2(\Omega^2-1)}{4m_0^2\Omega^6+2g^2m_0\tau\Omega^4(\Omega^2-1)+g^4\tau^2(1+2\Omega^2)}\right), \tag{44}$$

$$S^{(3)} = 2\tau\Omega^2\sigma\left(\frac{\sigma}{g^2}\right)'\left(\frac{g^2\tau+m_0\Omega^2(\Omega^2-1)}{4m_0^2\Omega^6+2g^2m_0\tau\Omega^4(\Omega^2-1)+g^4\tau^2(1+2\Omega^2)}\right). \tag{45}$$

Again, in the case when the fluctuation-dissipation relation holds we see that the noise-induced drift coincides with that obtained in the limit as $m \to 0$ of the Markovian model in

Section III.

Remark IV.2. The above calculation, together with the similar observation made for the previous model, suggests the following interesting question: is it true that, as long as the fluctuation-dissipation relation holds, one obtains the same noise-induced drift term in the limit, regardless of the choice of the colored noise used to model the environment? If the colored noise satisfies a linear system of SDEs, then it is natural to conjecture that the answer to the question is affirmative but otherwise we do not have an intuitive guess for the answer.

V. APPLICATION TO THE STUDY OF THERMOPHORESIS

We revisit the dynamics of a free Brownian particle immersed in a heat bath where a temperature gradient is present. This was previously studied in [36], in the one-dimensional setting. It was found there that the particle exhibits a drift in response to the temperature gradient due to the interplay between the inertial time scale and the noise correlation time scale. Such phenomenon is called thermophoresis. We refer to [36], [37] and the references therein for further descriptions of this phenomenon, including references to experiments.

Here we will study the dynamics of the particle in a (thermodynamic) non-equilibrium heat bath, where a generalized fluctuation-dissipation relation holds, in which both the diffusion coefficient and the temperature of the heat bath vary with the position. In contrast to [36], we take into account also the memory time scale (in addition to the inertial time scale and the noise correlation time scale) and model the position of the particle as the solution to a SIDE of the form (1).

For a spherical particle of radius R immersed in a fluid of viscosity μ, which in general is a function of the temperature $T = T(x)$ (and thus depends on x as well), the friction (or damping) coefficient γ satisfies the Stokes law [26]:

$$\gamma(x) = 6\pi\mu(T)R.$$

The diffusion coefficient $D(x)$ is related to the damping coefficient $\gamma(x)$ and the noise coefficient $\sigma(x)$ as follows:

$$\gamma(x) = \frac{k_B T(x)}{D(x)}, \quad \sigma(x) = \frac{k_B T(x)\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{D(x)}}, \tag{46}$$

so that the following generalized fluctuation-dissipation relation between damping and noise is satisfied:

$$\sigma^2(x_t) = 2k_B T(x_t)\gamma(x_t)$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Note that all the coefficients and the temperature are state-dependent — this is why we call the relation "generalized". In the following, we study two one-dimensional non-Markovian models for thermophoresis, one of which is driven by a Markovian colored noise and the other by a non-Markovian colored noise, in the case where the generalized fluctuation-dissipation relation above is obeyed.

A. Thermophoresis Model with Ornstein-Uhlenbeck Noise

The evolution of the position, $x_t \in \mathbb{R}$, of the particle is modeled by following SIDE:

$$m\ddot{x}_t = \sigma(x_t)\eta_t^0 - \sqrt{\gamma(x_t)}\int_0^t \alpha e^{-\alpha(t-s)}\sqrt{\gamma(x_s)}\dot{x}_s ds, \tag{47}$$

where η_t^0 is the stationary solution to the SDE:

$$d\eta_t^0 = -\alpha\eta_t^0 dt + \alpha dW_t, \tag{48}$$

i.e. we set $d = 1$, $\boldsymbol{F} = 0$, $\boldsymbol{g} = g := \sqrt{\gamma}$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \sigma$ in (4) and $\boldsymbol{A} = \alpha$ in (2), where γ and σ are given by (46). Note that the noise correlation function is proportional to the memory kernel in the SIDE (47), i.e.

$$E[\eta_t^0\eta_s^0] = \frac{\alpha}{2}e^{-\alpha|t-s|} = \frac{1}{2}\kappa_1(|t-s|),\ \ s,t \geq 0$$

and $g \propto \sigma$ only if T is position-independent.

Remark V.1. Heuristically, when the three time scales (i.e. the inertial time scale, the memory time scale and the noise correlation time scale) we are considering are small, the position variable varies slowly compared to the velocity and our assumptions imply an approximate fluctuation-dissipation relation:

$$E[\sigma(x_t)\eta_t^0(\sigma(x_s)\eta_s^0)] \approx \frac{\sigma^2(x)}{2}\alpha e^{-\alpha|t-s|} = k_B T(x)\gamma(x)\kappa_1(|t-s|).$$

We consider the effective dynamics of the particle in the limit when all the three characteristic time scales vanish at the same rate. In the following, the prime $'$ denotes derivative with respect to the argument of the function. Rescaling the mass m and the decay rate α by a factor of ϵ as in Section II, setting $\tau_\kappa = \tau_\eta = \tau$ and taking the limit as $\epsilon \to 0$ of the resulting rescaled version of (47)-(48), we find, by applying Theorem IV.1, that the limiting position process $X_t \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the SDE:

$$dX_t = b_1(X_t)dt + \sqrt{2D(X_t)}dW_t, \tag{49}$$

with the noise-induced drift $b_1(X) = S^{(1)}(X) + S^{(2)}(X) + S^{(3)}(X)$, where

$$S^{(1)}(X) = D'(X) - \frac{D(X)T'(X)}{T(X)},$$

$$S^{(2)}(X) = \left[-\frac{k_B T(X)D'(X)}{D(X)} + k_B T'(X)\right]\left[\frac{\tau D(X)}{\tau k_B T(X) + 2m_0\alpha D(X)}\right],$$

$$S^{(3)}(X) = \left[\frac{k_B T(X)D'(X)}{D(X)}\right]\left[\frac{\tau D(X)}{\tau k_B T(X) + 2m_0\alpha D(X)}\right].$$

We see that part of $S^{(2)}$ cancels $S^{(3)}$ and therefore the noise-induced drift is given by:

$$b_1(X) = D'(X) - \frac{2m_0\alpha D^2(X)}{\tau k_B T(X) + 2m_0\alpha D(X)} \frac{T'(X)}{T(X)}, \tag{50}$$

or using the Stokes law which gives

$$D(X) = \frac{k_B}{6\pi R} \frac{T(X)}{\mu(T)},$$

where $\mu(T) = \mu(T(X))$, we have

$$b_1(X) = k_B T'(X) \left(\frac{\tau}{2(\alpha m_0 + 3\pi R\tau\mu(T))} - \frac{\mu'(T)T(X)}{6\pi R\mu^2(T)} \right). \tag{51}$$

Equation (50) gives the thermophoretic drift induced by the vanishing of the three characteristic time scales. Since it arises in the absence of an external force acting on the particle, it is a "spurious drift" contributed by the presence of the temperature gradient and the state-dependence of the diffusion coefficient. We remark that this is a new result, as the drift term obtained here differs from the one obtained previously in [1] (see eqn. (118)). Our noise-induced drift appears to be more natural in the sense that the second term in (50) gives a correction due to the temperature profile to eqn. (101) in [1] (with $F = 0$) for the position of a Brownian particle in a diffusion gradient.

We discuss some physical implications of the thermophoretic drift given in (50). As discussed in [36], the sign of $b_1(X)$ determines the direction in which the particle is expected to travel. The particle will eventually reach some boundaries, which can be either absorbing or reflecting. In the reflecting boundaries case, the position of the particle reaches a steady-state distribution $\rho_\infty(X)$ in the limit $t \to \infty$. Assuming that the particle is confined to the interval (a, b), $a < b$,

$$\rho_\infty(X) = C \exp\left(- \int_a^X \frac{2\alpha}{r\gamma(y) + 2\alpha} \frac{T'(y)}{T(y)} dy \right)$$

can be verified to be a stationary density, where in terms of the original parameters of the model, $r := \tau/m_0 > 0$, and C is a normalizing constant. In particular, in absence of temperature gradient ($T'(y) = 0$), the particle is equally likely to be found anywhere in (a, b), whereas when a temperature gradient is present, the particle is more likely to be found in the hotter or in the colder region, depending on the parameters r, α, the position-dependent diffusion coefficient $D(X)$ and the temperature profile $T(X)$. In the limit $r \to \infty$, the particle's position is again distributed uniformly on (a, b). On the other hand, in the limit $r \to 0$ the stationary density is inversely proportional to the temperature, i.e. $\rho_\infty(X) = \tilde{C}T(X)^{-1}$, where $\tilde{C}$ is a normalizing constant. Thus, the particle is more likely to be found in the colder region. In the special case when $D(X)$ is proportional to $T(X)$, so that γ is independent of X, we have

$$\rho_\infty(X) = \tilde{C}T(X)^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha + r\gamma}},$$

where $\tilde{C}$ is a normalizing constant, so the particle is more likely to be found in the colder region, with the likelihood decreasing as r increases.

Next, we are going to study the sign of the thermophoretic drift directly using (50) (this

is in contrast to the approach in [36], where $\mu(T)$ is linearized around a fixed temperature). We find that $b_1(X) > 0$ if and only if

$$r > \frac{\alpha}{3\pi R\mu(T)}\left(\frac{\mu'(T)T(X)}{\mu(T)-\mu'(T)T(X)}\right),$$

where $\mu(T) = \mu(T(X))$ is obtained from the Stokes law and $\mu'(T)$ denotes derivative with respect to T. Thus, there is a critical ratio $r = \tau/m_0$, denoted r_c, such that $b_1(X)$ changes sign:

$$r_c = \frac{\alpha}{3\pi R\mu(T)}\left(\frac{\mu'(T)T(X)}{\mu(T)-\mu'(T)T(X)}\right),$$

in which case the corresponding stationary density is given by

$$\rho^c_\infty(X) = C\frac{\mu(T(X))}{T(X)},$$

where C is a normalizing constant. Note that the drift does not change sign if T is independent of X.

Finally, we discuss a special case. When $\mu(T) = \mu_0 > 0$ is a constant (so that $\gamma(X)$ is a constant), the thermophoretic drift is given by:

$$b_1(X) = \frac{k_B T'(X)}{6\pi R\mu_0}\left[1 - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha + 3\pi r R\mu_0}\right].$$

In agreement with the result in [36], $b_1(X)$ has the same sign as $T'(X)$, leading to an instantaneous flow towards the hotter region). The steady-state density is

$$\rho_\infty(X) = CT(X)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+3\pi r R\mu_0}},$$

where C is a normalizing constant, and the particle will be more likely to be found in the colder region for all $r > 0$. This is in agreement with experiments, even though the instantaneous thermophoretic drift actually directs the particle towards the hotter regions. Other special cases such as when $\mu(T)$ is linear or quadratic in T can also be analyzed (cf. [38]).

B. Thermophoresis Model with Non-Markovian (Harmonic) Noise

We repeat the analysis of the previous subsection in the case when the colored noise is a harmonic noise. We set $d = 1$, $\boldsymbol{F} = 0$, $\boldsymbol{g} = g := \sqrt{\gamma}$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \sigma$ in (7) so that the generalized fluctuation-dissipation relation holds. Then we rescale the resulting SIDE using a small parameter ϵ and consider the effective dynamics of the particle in the limit $\epsilon \to 0$ (with $\tau_\kappa = \tau_h = \tau$).

In this case, by applying Theorem IV.3, we find that the limiting position process $X_t \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the SDE:

$$dX_t = b_2(X_t)dt + \sqrt{2D(X_t)}dW_t,$$

where the noise-induced drift term is given by:

$$b_2(X) = D'(X) - \frac{(4m_0^2\Omega^6 D^2(X) + \tau^2(k_B T(X))^2)D(X)}{4m_0^2\Omega^6 D^2(X) + 2k_B T(X) m_0 \tau \Omega^4(\Omega^2-1)D(X) + \tau^2(1+2\Omega^2)(k_B T(X))^2}\frac{T'(X)}{T(X)}.$$

Note that $b_2(X)$ differs from $b_1(X)$ obtained previously and $b_2(X) \to b_1(X)$, with $\alpha = 1$ in the expression for $b_1(X)$, in the limit $\Omega \to \infty$.

In the reflecting boundaries case, the stationary solution for the particle's position is

$$\rho_\infty(X) = C\exp\left(-\int_a^X \frac{D(y)(4\Omega^6 D^2(y) + r^2(k_B T(y))^2)}{4\Omega^6 D^2(y) + 2r\Omega^4(\Omega^2-1)D(y)k_B T(y) + r^2(1+2\Omega^2)(k_B T(y))^2}\frac{T'(y)}{T(y)}dy\right),$$

where $r := \tau/m_0 > 0$ and C is a normalizing constant. Similarly to the previous model, in the absence of temperature gradient (i.e. when T is a constant), the particle is equally likely to be found anywhere in (a, b). When a temperature gradient is present, the particle is more likely to be found either in the hotter or in the colder region, depending on the parameters r, α, the position-dependent diffusion coefficient $D(X)$ and the temperature profile $T(X)$. However, in contrast to the previous model, in the limit $r \to \infty$ the particle is not distributed uniformly on (a, b) and in the limit $r \to 0$ the stationary density is no longer inversely proportional to the temperature. Both distributions depend on the diffusion coefficient $D(X)$ as well as the temperature profile $T(X)$.

We can also study the sign of the thermophoretic drift. In this case there can be up to two critical ratios, r_c, such that the $b_2(X)$ changes sign, as the equation $b_2(X) = 0$ is a quadratic equation in r. In the special case when $\mu(T) = \mu_0 > 0$ is a constant (and thus so is $\gamma(X)$), the thermophoretic drift is given by:

$$b_2(X) = \frac{k_B T'(X)}{6\pi R\mu_0}\left[1 - \frac{\Omega^6 + 9\pi^2 R^2 r^2 \mu_0^2}{\Omega^6 + 3\pi R r\Omega^4(\Omega^2-1)\mu_0 + 9\pi^2 R^2 r^2(1+2\Omega^2)\mu_0^2}\right].$$

In contrast to the result in previous model, $b_2(X)$ has the same sign as $T'(X)$ provided that

$$r > \frac{\Omega^2(1-\Omega^2)}{6\pi R\mu_0}.$$

Thus, $b_2(X)$ and $T'(X)$ do not share the same sign for all $r > 0$, unless $|\Omega| \geq 1$. Thus, according to this model, presence of a temperature gradient allows us to tune the parameters (m_0, τ, Ω) to control the direction which the particle travels. The steady-state density in this case is

$$\rho_\infty(X) = CT(X)^{-\frac{\Omega^6 + 9\pi^2 R^2 r^2 \mu_0^2}{\Omega^6 + 3\pi R r\Omega^4(\Omega^2-1)\mu_0 + 9\pi^2 R^2 r^2(1+2\Omega^2)\mu_0^2}},$$

where C is a normalizing constant. The particle will be more likely found in the colder region for all $r > 0$ if $|\Omega| \geq 1$, whereas this might not be true for all $r > 0$ if $|\Omega| < 1$. One can also study other special cases when $\mu(T)$ is linear or quadratic in T, as mentioned in the previous subsection.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND FINAL REMARKS

We have studied the homogenization of a class of non-Markovian Langevin equations in the limit when three characteristic time scales, i.e. the inertial time, the characteristic memory time in the damping term, and the correlation time of colored noise driving the equations, vanish at the same rate. We have derived effective equations, which are simpler in three respects:

1. The number of degrees of freedom is reduced, since the velocity variables have been homogenized.
2. The equations become regular SDEs, since the memory time has been taken to zero.
3. The system is driven by a white noise.

Nevertheless, *noise-induced drifts* are present in the limiting equations, resulting from the dependence of the coefficients of the original model on the state of the system. We apply the general results to a study of thermophoretic drift, correcting the formulae obtained in an earlier work [36]. In systems, satisfying a fluctuation-dissipation relation, the limiting equation coincides with that of [1], but in general new terms appear, absent in the case without memory. To prove the main theorem, we strengthened the main result of [1].

Homogenization of other non-Markovian models can also be studied using the methods of this paper. An example is a system with exponentially decaying memory kernel, driven by white noise in the limit as the inertial and memory time scales vanish at the same rate. In this case the noise-induced drift in the limiting equation will consist of two terms, not three, as in the case studied here.

The two types of colored noise, Ornstein-Uhlenbeck and harmonic noises, have correlations decaying exponentially (short-range memory). One may consider other colored noises such as fractional Gaussian noises, with correlations decaying as a power, relevant for modeling anomalous diffusion phenomena in fields ranging from biology to finance [40]. In particular, it would be interesting to answer the question posed in Remark IV.2 for this class of SIDEs in the case when the fluctuation-dissipation relation holds.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors were partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1615045. They learned the method of introducing additional variables to eliminate the memory term from E. Vanden-Eijnden.

APPENDIX A: DERIVATION OF SIDES FROM A HAMILTONIAN MODEL

We derive a special case of SIDEs (4) and (7) from a Hamiltonian model for a small system (Brownian particle) in contact with a heat bath, which is initially in a thermal equilibrium. The particle moves in a potential U. The heat bath is modeled as a system of non-interacting harmonic oscillators whose initial energy is distributed according to the Gibbs distribution at temperature T. The Brownian particle is coupled to each harmonic oscillator in the bath. This model is used widely to study many systems in statistical physics [42].

One approach to derive the equations is to assume first that there are finitely many harmonic oscillators in the bath (Kac-Zwanzig model [43],[44]). One then takes the thermodynamic limit by sending the number of oscillators to infinity in the resulting equations

(replacing finite sum over oscillator frequencies by an integral), arguing that the set of frequencies must be dense to allow dissipation of energy from the system to the bath and to eliminate Poincaré recurrence. Another approach, which is more technically involved, is to replace the finite system of oscillator equations by a wave equation [45]. We will derive the SIDEs by adopting the former approach in the multi-dimensional case.

We consider the situation where the coupling is nonlinear in the particle's position and linear in the bath variables. Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}} = (\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{(N+1)d}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{p}} = (\boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{p}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{p}_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{(N+1)d}$. The Hamiltonian of the system plus bath is:

$$H(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{p}}) = \frac{|\boldsymbol{p}|^2}{2m} + U(\boldsymbol{x}) + \sum_{k=1}^{N} \left(\frac{|\boldsymbol{p}_k|^2}{2m_k} + \frac{1}{2} m_k \omega_k^2 \left| \boldsymbol{x}_k - \frac{\boldsymbol{c}_k}{m_k \omega_k^2} \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}) \right|^2 \right),$$

where m is the particle's mass, m_k is the mass of the kth bath oscillator, $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are respectively the particle's position and momentum, $\boldsymbol{x}_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\boldsymbol{p}_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\omega_k \in \mathbb{R}^+$ $(k = 1, \ldots, N)$ are respectively the position, momentum and frequency of the kth bath oscillator, $\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}) := (f_1(\boldsymbol{x}), \ldots, f_d(\boldsymbol{x}))$ is a vector function of $\boldsymbol{x} := (x^{(1)}, \ldots, x^{(d)})$ and $\boldsymbol{c}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ are coupling matrices that specify the coupling strength between the system and the kth bath oscillator. We assume each f_j $(j = 1, \ldots, d)$ is continuously differentiable in $x^{(k)}$, for every $k = 1, \ldots, d$.

To derive SIDE for the particle's position and momentum, we start by plugging the expression for $H(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{p}})$ into the Hamilton's equations to obtain:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{x}} = \frac{\boldsymbol{p}}{m}, \tag{52}$$

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{p}} = -\boldsymbol{\nabla}_{\boldsymbol{x}} U(\boldsymbol{x}) + \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}) \sum_k \boldsymbol{c}_k \left(\boldsymbol{x}_k - \frac{\boldsymbol{c}_k}{m_k \omega_k^2} \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}) \right), \tag{53}$$

$$\boldsymbol{x}_k = \frac{\boldsymbol{p}_k}{m_k}, \quad k = 1, \ldots, N, \tag{54}$$

$$\boldsymbol{p}_k = -m_k \omega_k^2 \boldsymbol{x}_k + \boldsymbol{c}_k \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}), \quad k = 1, \ldots, N, \tag{55}$$

where $\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x})$ denotes the Jacobian matrix $\left(\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x^{(j)}} \right)_{ij}$.

Next, we eliminate the bath variables $\boldsymbol{x}_k, \boldsymbol{p}_k$, $k = 1, \ldots, N$, from the system's dynamics. Solving for $\boldsymbol{x}_k(t)$ in terms of $\boldsymbol{x}(t)$:

$$\boldsymbol{x}_k(t) = \boldsymbol{x}_k(0) \cos(\omega_k t) + \frac{\boldsymbol{p}_k(0)}{m_k \omega_k} \sin(\omega_k t) + \frac{\boldsymbol{c}_k}{m_k \omega_k} \int_0^t \sin(\omega_k (t-s)) \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}(s)) ds.$$

Plugging this into (53), we obtain:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{p}}(t) = -\boldsymbol{\nabla}_{\boldsymbol{x}} U(\boldsymbol{x}(t)) + \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}(t)) \sum_k \frac{\boldsymbol{c}_k \boldsymbol{c}_k^*}{m_k \omega_k^2} \left(\int_0^t \omega_k \sin(\omega_k (t-s)) \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}(s)) ds - \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}(t)) \right) + \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}(t)) \boldsymbol{F}(t),$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{F}(t) = \sum_k \boldsymbol{c}_k \left(\boldsymbol{x}_k(0) \cos(\boldsymbol{w}_k t) + \frac{\boldsymbol{p}_k(0)}{m_k \omega_k} \sin(\omega_k t) \right).$$

In the integral term above, we integrate by parts to obtain:

$$\int_0^t \omega_k \sin(\omega_k(t-s))\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}(s))ds = \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}(t)) - \cos(\omega_k t)\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}(0)) - \int_0^t \cos(\omega_k(t-s))\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}(s))\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}(s)ds.$$

Using this, the equation for $\boldsymbol{p}(t)$ becomes:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{p}}(t) = -\boldsymbol{\nabla}_{\boldsymbol{x}} U(\boldsymbol{x}(t)) - \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}(t)) \int_0^t \boldsymbol{\kappa}(t-s)\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}(s))\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}(s)ds + \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}(t))\boldsymbol{\xi}(t),$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{\kappa}(t) = \sum_k \frac{\boldsymbol{c}_k \boldsymbol{c}_k^*}{m_k \omega_k^2} \cos(\omega_k t)$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}(t) = \boldsymbol{F}(t) - \boldsymbol{\kappa}(t)\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}(0)) = \sum_k \boldsymbol{c}_k \left(\left(\boldsymbol{x}_k(0) - \frac{\boldsymbol{c}_k}{m_k \omega_k^2} \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}(0)) \right) \cos(\omega_k t) + \frac{\boldsymbol{p}_k(0)}{m_k \omega_k} \sin(\omega_k t) \right).$$

Note that $\boldsymbol{\xi}(t)$ is expressed in terms of the initial values of the bath variables $\boldsymbol{x}_k(0)$ and $\boldsymbol{p}_k(0)$. If all these initial values are known, then $\boldsymbol{\xi}(t)$ is a deterministic force. However, one rarely has a complete information about these initial values and this is where the introduction of randomness can help to simplify the model. If we thus assume that the bath has a huge number of variables ($N \gg 1$) that are independent and identically distributed, $\boldsymbol{\xi}(t)$ is approximately Gaussian by the central limit theorem. $\boldsymbol{\xi}(t)$ is a stationary, Gaussian process, if it is conditionally averaged with respect to the following Gaussian equilibrium ensemble:

$$\rho((\boldsymbol{x}_k, \boldsymbol{p}_k) \mid \boldsymbol{x}(0) = \boldsymbol{x}) = Z^{-1} \exp\left(-\beta \left(\sum_{k=1}^N \frac{|\boldsymbol{p}_k|^2}{2m_k} + \frac{1}{2} m_k \omega_k^2 \left| \boldsymbol{x}_k - \frac{\boldsymbol{c}_k}{m_k \omega_k^2} \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}) \right|^2 \right) \right),$$

where $\beta = 1/(k_B T)$ and Z is the partition function. Taking the averages of the bath variables with respect to the above density, one finds that:

$$E_\rho \left[\boldsymbol{x}_k(0) - \frac{\boldsymbol{c}_k}{m_k \omega_k^2} \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}(0)) \;\middle|\; \boldsymbol{x}(0) = \boldsymbol{x} \right] = 0, \quad E_\rho[\boldsymbol{p}_k(0) \mid \boldsymbol{x}(0) = \boldsymbol{x}] = 0,$$

$$E_\rho \left[\left(\boldsymbol{x}_k(0) - \frac{\boldsymbol{c}_k}{m_k \omega_k^2} \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}(0)) \right)^2 \;\middle|\; \boldsymbol{x}(0) = \boldsymbol{x} \right] = \frac{k_B T}{m_k \omega_k^2}, \quad E_\rho[\boldsymbol{p}_k(0)^2 \mid \boldsymbol{x}(0) = \boldsymbol{x}] = k_B T,$$

where E_ρ denotes mathematical expectation with respect to ρ. Therefore, it follows that for this initial distribution of the bath variables we have the fluctuation-dissipation relation:

$$E_\rho[\boldsymbol{\xi}(t)] = 0, \quad E_\rho[\boldsymbol{\xi}(t)\boldsymbol{\xi}(s)^*] = k_B T \boldsymbol{\kappa}(t-s).$$

We remark that the memory function $\boldsymbol{\kappa}(t)$ and the "color" of the noise $\boldsymbol{\xi}(t)$ are determined by the bath spectrum and the system-bath coupling. We set $m_k = 1$ for all k and pass to the continuum limit by replacing the sum over k in $\boldsymbol{\kappa}(t)$ by an integral $\int_{\mathbb{R}^+} d\omega n(\omega)$, where

$n(\omega)$ is a density of states. Then if $\boldsymbol{c}$ is a matrix-valued function of ω, the memory function $\boldsymbol{\kappa}(t)$ becomes:

$$\boldsymbol{\kappa}(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} d\omega n(\omega) \frac{\boldsymbol{c}(\omega)\boldsymbol{c}(\omega)^*}{\omega^2} \cos(\omega t).$$

We take $n(\omega) = \omega^2$ (Debye-type spectrum). If we choose $\boldsymbol{c}(\omega)$ to be a scalar multiple of the identity matrix $\boldsymbol{I}$, then $\boldsymbol{\kappa}(t)$ is proportional to $\delta(t)\boldsymbol{I}$. This leads to a Langevin equation driven by white noise, in which the damping term is instantaneous. If we choose $\boldsymbol{c}(\omega)$ to be the diagonal matrix with the ith entry

$$\sqrt{\frac{2\alpha_i^2}{\pi} \frac{1}{\omega^2 + \alpha_i^2}},$$

where $\alpha_i > 0$, then we have:

$$\boldsymbol{\kappa}(t) = \boldsymbol{A} e^{-\boldsymbol{A}t},$$

where $\boldsymbol{A}$ is the constant diagonal matrix with the ith entry equal α_i. This gives SIDE (4). On the other hand, choosing $\boldsymbol{c}(\omega)$ to be the diagonal matrix with the ith entry

$$\frac{\omega_{ii}^2}{\tau_{ii}^2} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\omega^2(\omega_{ii}^2/\tau_{ii})^2 + (\omega^2 - (\omega_{ii}/\tau_{ii})^2)^2}}$$

allows us to obtain the memory kernel that gives SIDE (7), where the ω_{ii} and τ_{ii} are the diagonal entries of the matrix $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ and $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ respectively.

APPENDIX B: A SUFFICIENT CONDITION FOR $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ TO BE POSITIVE STABLE

First, we make the following observation. Consider the following 2 by 2 block matrix:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{E}} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{P} & \boldsymbol{Q} \\ \boldsymbol{R} & \boldsymbol{S} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\boldsymbol{P}, \boldsymbol{Q}, \boldsymbol{R}, \boldsymbol{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $\boldsymbol{S}$ is invertible and $\boldsymbol{R}$ commutes with $\boldsymbol{S}$. Then since

$$\det\left(\begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{P} & \boldsymbol{Q} \\ \boldsymbol{R} & \boldsymbol{S} \end{bmatrix}\right) = \det\left(\begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{P} & \boldsymbol{Q} \\ \boldsymbol{R} & \boldsymbol{S} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{S} & \boldsymbol{0} \\ -\boldsymbol{R} & \boldsymbol{S}^{-1} \end{bmatrix}\right) = \det\left(\begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{PS} - \boldsymbol{QR} & \boldsymbol{QS}^{-1} \\ \boldsymbol{RS} - \boldsymbol{SR} & \boldsymbol{I} \end{bmatrix}\right),$$

we have $\det(\hat{\boldsymbol{E}}) = \det(\boldsymbol{PS} - \boldsymbol{QR})$, where we have used the fact that determinant of a product of two matrices is the product of determinants of their matrices and determinant of a 2 by 2 triangular block matrix equals the determinant of the product of the matrices on its diagonal. More generally, one can consider an N by N block matrix where all pairs of the blocks commute. In this case, the determinant can be found by first computing the determinant of each block and then taking the determinant of the resulting d by d matrix [46].

Lemma 3. Assume that $\boldsymbol{g}$ and $\boldsymbol{A}$ are positive definite matrices and $\boldsymbol{g}$ commutes with $\boldsymbol{A}$. Then $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ in (22) is positive stable.

Remark VI.1. Therefore, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ is positive stable when $\boldsymbol{g}$ is positive definite and $\boldsymbol{A} = \alpha \boldsymbol{I}$, with $\alpha > 0$, in which case the colored noise $\boldsymbol{\eta}_t$ has independent components.

Proof. We denote the upper left 2 by 2 block matrix of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ by

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{U}} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{0} & \frac{\boldsymbol{g}}{m_0} \\ -\frac{\boldsymbol{Ag}}{\tau_\kappa} & \frac{\boldsymbol{A}}{\tau_\kappa} \end{bmatrix}.$$

By the triangular-block structure of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$, we see that the eigenvalues of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ are the eigenvalues of $\hat{\boldsymbol{U}}$ and $\frac{\boldsymbol{A}}{\tau_\eta}$. The eigenvalues of $\frac{\boldsymbol{A}}{\tau_\eta}$ are clearly real and positive by assumption. Thus, one only needs to examine the eigenvalues of $\hat{\boldsymbol{U}}$.

As $\boldsymbol{g}$ commutes with $\boldsymbol{A}$, the matrices $\boldsymbol{g}$ and $\boldsymbol{A}$ can be simultaneously brought to a diagonal form, i.e. there exist unitary $\boldsymbol{p}$ such that $\boldsymbol{g} = \boldsymbol{pkp}^{-1}$ and $\boldsymbol{A} = \boldsymbol{pdp}^{-1}$, where $\boldsymbol{k}$ and $\boldsymbol{d}$ are diagonal with the (real) eigenvalues of $\boldsymbol{g}$ and $\boldsymbol{A}$ as their diagonal entries respectively. Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{P}}$ be the 2 by 2 diagonal block matrix with both diagonal blocks equal $\boldsymbol{p}$. Then we have:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{U}} = \boldsymbol{P}\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}\hat{\boldsymbol{P}}^{-1},$$

where

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{0} & \frac{\boldsymbol{k}}{m_0} \\ -\frac{\boldsymbol{dk}}{\tau_\kappa} & \frac{\boldsymbol{d}}{\tau_\kappa} \end{bmatrix}.$$

As $\hat{\boldsymbol{U}}$ is similar to $\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}$, we compute the eigenvalues of $\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}$. We have

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}} - \lambda \boldsymbol{I} = \begin{bmatrix} -\lambda \boldsymbol{I} & \frac{\boldsymbol{k}}{m_0} \\ -\frac{\boldsymbol{dk}}{\tau_\kappa} & \frac{\boldsymbol{d}}{\tau_\kappa} - \lambda \boldsymbol{I} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, using earlier observation on the determinant of certain 2 by 2 block matrices, and noting that the determinant of a diagonal matrix is the product of the diagonal entries, we have:

$$\det(\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}} - \lambda \boldsymbol{I}) = \det\left(\lambda\left(\lambda \boldsymbol{I} - \frac{\boldsymbol{d}}{\tau_\kappa}\right) + \frac{1}{m_0 \tau_\kappa}\boldsymbol{dk}^2\right) = \prod_{i=1}^{d}\left[\lambda\left(\lambda - \frac{d_{ii}}{\tau_\kappa}\right) + \frac{d_{ii}k_{ii}^2}{m_0\tau_\kappa}\right],$$

where the $k_{ii}^2 > 0$ are the diagonal entries of $\boldsymbol{k}^2$, i.e. they are the eigenvalues of $\boldsymbol{g}^2$, and the $d_{ii} > 0$ are the diagonal entries of $\boldsymbol{d}$.

Thus, the eigenvalues of $\hat{\boldsymbol{Z}}$ are the solutions to the quadratic equation:

$$\lambda^2 - \frac{d_{jj}}{\tau_\kappa}\lambda + \frac{k_{jj}^2 d_{jj}}{m_0 \tau_\kappa} = 0,$$

i.e.

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{d_{jj}}{\tau_\kappa} \pm \sqrt{\frac{d_{jj}^2}{\tau_\kappa^2} - \frac{4 d_{jj} k_{jj}^2}{m_0 \tau_\kappa}}\right), \quad j = 1, \dots d.$$

Clearly the real parts of these eigenvalues are positive, thus $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ is positive stable. □

Lemma 4. Assume that $\boldsymbol{g}$ is a positive definite matrix and commutes with $\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2$. Then $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ in (34) is positive stable.

Proof. We denote the upper left 3 by 3 block matrix of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ by

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{U}} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{0} & \frac{\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)}{m_0} & \frac{\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)}{m_0} \\ -\frac{\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}_t)}{\tau_\kappa} & \frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2}{2\tau_\kappa} & \frac{2\boldsymbol{I}}{\tau_\kappa} - \frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2}{2\tau_\kappa} \\ \boldsymbol{0} & -\frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2}{2\tau_\kappa} & \frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2}{2\tau_\kappa} \end{bmatrix},$$

and the lower right 2 by 2 block matrix by

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{L}} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{0} & -\frac{1}{\tau_h}\boldsymbol{I} \\ \frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2}{\tau_h} & \frac{\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2}{\tau_h} \end{bmatrix}.$$

By the triangular-block structure of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$, we see that its eigenvalues are the eigenvalues of $\hat{\boldsymbol{U}}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{L}}$. As $\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2$ is a positive diagonal matrix, it can be easily verified that all the eigenvalues of $\hat{\boldsymbol{L}}$ have positive real parts. So one only needs to examine the eigenvalues of $\hat{\boldsymbol{U}}$.

As $\boldsymbol{g}$ commutes with $\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2$ and $2\boldsymbol{I} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}^2/2$, we can proceed by repeating the arguments given in the proof of the previous lemma. Therefore, it suffices to show that all the eigenvalues of any 3 by 3 matrix of the form

$$\boldsymbol{K} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \frac{g}{m_0} & \frac{g}{m_0} \\ -\frac{g}{\tau_\kappa} & \frac{\Omega^2}{2\tau_\kappa} & \frac{2}{\tau_\kappa} - \frac{\Omega^2}{2\tau_\kappa} \\ 0 & -\frac{\Omega^2}{2\tau_\kappa} & \frac{\Omega^2}{2\tau_\kappa} \end{bmatrix},$$

where g and Ω^2 are arbitrary positive real numbers, have positive real parts.

We will show that all eigenvalues of $-\boldsymbol{K}$ have negative real parts by applying the Routh-Hurwitz stability criterion (see Theorem 4.4 in [47]) to conclude the proof. The eigenvalues of $-\boldsymbol{K}$ are the solutions to the following cubic equation:

$$\lambda^3 + a_1\lambda^2 + a_2\lambda + a_3 = 0,$$

where

$$a_1 = \frac{\Omega^2}{\tau_\kappa}, \quad a_2 = \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{2\tau_\kappa}\right)^2 + \frac{g^2}{m_0\tau_\kappa}, \quad a_3 = \frac{(g\Omega)^2}{m_0\tau_\kappa^2}.$$

The Routh-Hurwitz criterion gives the following conditions on the a_i, $i = 1, 2, 3$:

$$a_1 > 0, \quad a_3 > 0, \quad a_1 a_2 > a_3,$$

which are clearly fulfilled by the above expressions for the a_i's. □

VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

[1] S. Hottovy, G. Volpe, and J. Wehr, *The Smoluchowski-Kramers limit of stochastic differential equations with arbitrary state-dependent friction*, Preprint (Comm. Math. Phys, in press) , arXiv:1404.2330 (2014).

[2] A. J. Majda, I. Timofeyev, and E. Vanden Eijnden, *A mathematical framework for stochastic climate models*, Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics **54**, 891 (2001).

[3] D. Givon, R. Kupferman, and A. Stuart, *Extracting macroscopic dynamics: model problems and algorithms*, Nonlinearity **17**, R55 (2004).

[4] G. A. Pavliotis and A. M. Stuart, *Analysis of White Noise Limits for Stochastic Systems with Two Fast Relaxation Times*, ArXiv Mathematical Physics e-prints (2005), math-ph/0504054.

[5] G. Pavliotis and A. Stuart, *Multiscale methods*, Texts in Applied Mathematics, Vol. 53 (Springer, New York, 2008).

[6] E. Nelson, E. Nelson, E. Nelson, and E. Nelson, *Dynamical theories of Brownian motion*, Vol. 2 (Princeton university press Princeton, 1967).

[7] T. Franosch, M. Grimm, M. Belushkin, F. M. Mor, G. Foffi, L. Forró, and S. Jeney, *Resonances arising from hydrodynamic memory in Brownian motion*, Nature **478**, 85 (2011).

[8] S. Gröblacher, A. Trubarov, N. Prigge, G. Cole, M. Aspelmeyer, and J. Eisert, *Observation of non-Markovian micromechanical Brownian motion*, Nature communications **6**, 7606 (2015).

[9] A. McDaniel, O. Duman, G. Volpe, and J. Wehr, *An SDE approximation for stochastic differential delay equations with colored state-dependent noise*, (2014), arXiv:1406.7287.

[10] S. Hottovy, A. McDaniel, and J. Wehr, *A small delay and correlation time limit of stochastic differential delay equations with state-dependent colored noise*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.05065 (2015).

[11] N. Van Kampen, *Remarks on non-Markov processes*, Brazilian Journal of Physics **28**, 90 (1998).

[12] J. Łuczka, *Non-Markovian stochastic processes: Colored noise*, Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science **15**, 026107 (2005).

[13] G. Samorodnitsky and M. Taqqu, Stable Non-Gaussian Random Processes: Stochastic Models with Infinite Variance, Stochastic Modeling Series (Taylor & Francis, 1994).

[14] L. Stella, C. D. Lorenz, and L. Kantorovich, *Generalized Langevin equation: An efficient approach to nonequilibrium molecular dynamics of open systems*, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 134303 (2014).

[15] S. Bhattacharya, S. Chattopadhyay, P. Chaudhury, and J. R. Chaudhuri, *Phase induced transport of a Brownian particle in a periodic potential in the presence of an external noise: A semiclassical treatment*, Journal of Mathematical Physics **52**, 073302 (2011).

[16] S. A. McKinley, L. Yao, and M. G. Forest, *Transient anomalous diffusion of tracer particles in soft matter*, Journal of Rheology (1978-present) **53**, 1487 (2009).

[17] S. Adelman and J. Doll, *Generalized Langevin equation approach for atom/solid-surface scattering: General formulation for classical scattering off harmonic solids*, The Journal of chemical physics **64**, 2375 (1976).

[18] M. Ottobre and G. A. Pavliotis, *Asymptotic analysis for the generalized Langevin equation*, Nonlinearity **24**, 1629 (2011), arXiv:1003.4203 [math-ph].

[19] M. Dygas, B. Matkowsky, and Z. Schuss, *A singular perturbation approach to non-Markovian escape rate problems with state dependent friction*, The Journal of chemical physics **84**, 3731 (1986).

[20] M. M. Dygas, B. Matkowsky, and Z. Schuss, *A singular perturbation approach to non-Markovian escape rate problems*, SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics **46**, 265 (1986).

[21] G. Pavliotis, *Stochastic Processes and Applications: Diffusion Processes, the Fokker-Planck and Langevin Equations*, Texts in Applied Mathematics (Springer New York, 2014).

[22] L. Schimansky-Geier and C. Zülicke, *Harmonic noise: Effect on bistable systems*, Zeitschrift für Physik B Condensed Matter **79**, 451 (1990).

[23] A. McDaniel, O. Duman, G. Volpe, and J. Wehr, *An SDE approximation for stochastic differential delay equations with colored state-dependent noise*, ArXiv e-prints (2014), arXiv:1406.7287 [math.PR].

[24] P. Hänggi, P. Jung, C. Zerbe, and F. Moss, *Can colored noise improve stochastic resonance?*, Journal of Statistical Physics **70**, 25 (1993).

[25] J.-P. Eckmann, C.-A. Pillet, and L. Rey-Bellet, *Non-equilibrium statistical mechanics of anharmonic chains coupled to two heat baths at different temperatures*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **201**, 657 (1999).

[26] M. Toda, R. Kubo, R. Kubo, M. Toda, N. Saito, N. Hashitsume, and N. Hashitsume, *Statistical Physics II: Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics*, Springer Series in Solid-State Sciences (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012).

[27] R. Zwanzig, *Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics* (Oxford University Press, 2001).

[28] I. Karatzas and S. Shreve, *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*, Vol. 113 (Springer Science & Business Media, 2012).

[29] S. Hottovy, G. Volpe, and J. Wehr, *Noise-Induced Drift in Stochastic Differential Equations with Arbitrary Friction and Diffusion in the Smoluchowski-Kramers Limit*, Journal of Statistical Physics **146**, 762 (2012).

[30] D. P. Herzog, S. Hottovy, and G. Volpe, *The Small-Mass Limit for Langevin Dynamics with Unbounded Coefficients and Positive Friction*, Journal of Statistical Physics **163**, 659 (2016).

[31] J. Birrell, S. Hottovy, G. Volpe, and J. Wehr, *Small Mass Limit of a Langevin Equation on a Manifold*, ArXiv e-prints (2016), arXiv:1604.04819 [math-ph].

[32] J. Birrell and J. Wehr, *Homogenization of Dissipative, Noisy, Hamiltonian Dynamics*, ArXiv e-prints (2016), arXiv:1608.08194 [math-ph].

[33] G. Volpe and J. Wehr, *Effective drifts in dynamical systems with multiplicative noise: a review of recent progress*, Reports on Progress in Physics **79**, 053901 (2016).

[34] R. Horn and C. Johnson, *Topics in Matrix Analysis* (Cambridge University Press, 1994).

[35] Y. Kabanov and S. Pergamenshchikov, *Two-Scale Stochastic Systems: Asymptotic Analysis and Control*, Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013).

[36] S. Hottovy, G. Volpe, and J. Wehr, *Thermophoresis of Brownian particles driven by coloured noise*, EPL **99**, 60002 (2012).

[37] R. Piazza and A. Parola, *Thermophoresis in colloidal suspensions*, Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter **20**, 153102 (2008).

[38] S. Hottovy, G. Volpe, and J. Wehr, *Noise-induced drift in stochastic differential equations with arbitrary friction and diffusion in the Smoluchowski-Kramers limit*, J. Stat. Phys. **146**, 762 (2012).

[39] R. Kupferman, *Fractional Kinetics in Kac–Zwanzig Heat Bath Models*, Journal of Statistical Physics **114**, 291 (2004).

[40] S. Kou and X. S. Xie, *Generalized Langevin equation with fractional Gaussian noise: subdiffusion within a single protein molecule*, Physical review letters **93**, 180603 (2004).

[41] L. Li, J.-G. Liu, and J. Lu, *Fractional stochastic differential equations satisfying fluctuation-dissipation theorem*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.04274 (2016).

[42] G. Ford, M. Kac, and P. Mazur, *Statistical mechanics of assemblies of coupled oscillators*, Journal of Mathematical Physics **6**, 504 (1965).

[43] R. Zwanzig, *Nonlinear generalized Langevin equations*, Journal of Statistical Physics **9**, 215 (1973).

[44] P. Hänggi, *Generalized Langevin equations: A useful tool for the perplexed modeller of nonequilibrium fluctuations?*, in *Stochastic dynamics* (Springer, 1997) pp. 15–22.

[45] L. Rey-Bellet, *Open classical systems*, in *Open Quantum Systems II* (Springer, 2006) pp. 41–78.

[46] J. R. Silvester, *Determinants of block matrices*, The Mathematical Gazette **84**, 460 (2000).

[47] L. Allen, *An Introduction to Mathematical Biology* (Pearson/Prentice Hall, 2007).